Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/edinburghreviewo99londuoft

THE

# EDINBURGH REVIEW,

OR

# *CRITICAL JOURNAL:*

FOR

## JANUARY, 1854 . . . . APRIL, 1854.

*TO BE CONTINUED QUARTERLY.*

---

JUDEX DAMNATUR CUM NOCENS ABSOLVITUR.

PUBLIUS SYRUS.

---

VOL. XCIX.

LONGMAN, BROWN, GREEN, AND LONGMANS, LONDON:
AND ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK,
EDINBURGH.

1854.

19504
9|12|91
b.

London:
A. and G. A. Spottiswoode,
New-street-Square.

# CONTENTS OF No. 201.


Page

ART. I.—1. Memorials and Correspondence of Charles James Fox. Edited by Lord John Russell. 2 vols. 8vo. London: 1853.

2. Memoirs of the Court and Cabinets of George the Third, from original Family Documents. By the Duke of Buckingham and Chandos, K. G. 2 vols. 8vo. Second edition, revised. London: 1853, . 1

II.—1. Annual Report of the Blind School, St. George's Fields. 1853.

2. Letter to the Rt. Hon. Lord Wharncliffe on the Phonetic System for the Blind. By J. H. Frere, Esq. 1843.

3. Annual Report of the Pennsylvanian Institution for the Instruction of the Blind.

4. Tangible Typography, or how the Blind read. By E. C. Johnson, Esq. 1853.

5. The Lost Senses. By J. Kitto. 1845.

6. Observations on different Modes of Educating the Blind. By Rev. W. Taylor, F. R. S. 1853.

7. A History of France for Children. By Lord Cranborne.

8. Des Aveugles. Considérations sur leur Etat Physique, Moral et Intellectuel. Par P. A. Dufau. Paris: 1850, . . . . . 61

III.—1. A Bill to make better Provision for the Management of Episcopal and Capitular Estates. (Brought in by the Marquis of Blandford and Captain Kingscote.) London: 1853.

2. A Bill to amend the Laws respecting Simony. (Brought in by Dr. R. Phillimore and Viscount Goderich.) London: 1853, . . . . 94

IV.—First Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into and report upon the System of superintending and executing Public Works in the Madras Presidency. Submitted to the Right Honourable the Governor in Council of Fort St. George on the 23rd December, 1852. Madras: 1852, . . . 130

Page

V.—1. A Bill for the Promotion of Education in Cities and Boroughs in England, prepared and brought in by Lord John Russell and Mr. Secretary-at-War. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed 7th April, 1853, . . . . . 158

[And other Works.]

VI.—1. Vanity Fair: a Novel without a Hero. By William Makepeace Thackeray. London: 1849.

2. The History of Pendennis. By William Makepeace Thackeray. London: 1849.

3. The History of Henry Esmond, a Colonel in the Service of Her Majesty Queen Anne. Written by himself. London: 1853.

4. The English Humourists of the Eighteenth Century: a Series of Lectures. By William Makepeace Thackeray. London: 1853, . . . 196

VII.—1. Report from the Select Committee on the Office of Speaker; together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, &c. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 12th May, 1853.

2. Returns of the Sittings of the House of Commons, 1852-53: of the Divisions of the House; Public Bills; Private Bills; Public Committees; and Election Petitions. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 16th August, 1853.

3. A practical Treatise on the Law, Privileges, Proceedings, and Usage of Parliament. By Thomas Erskine May, Esq. Second Edition. London: 1851.

4. The Rules of Proceeding and Debate in Deliberative Assemblies. By Luther S. Cushing. Boston: 1853, . . . . . 243

VIII.—1. Lettres sur la Turquie, ou Tableau statistique, religieux, politique, administratif, militaire, commercial de l'Empire Ottoman depuis le Khatti-Cherif de Gulhani. Par M. A. Ubicini. Paris: 1853.

2. Zustand der Türkei im Jahre der Prophezeihung, 1853. Von Hubert von Boehn, Königlich Preussischem Second-Lieutenant. Berlin: 1853.

3. The Ottoman Empire and its Resources, with Statistical Tables, &c. By Edward H. Michelsen, Phil. D. London: 1853.

4. Three Years in Constantinople; or, Domestic Manners of the Turks in 1844. By Charles White, Esq. London: 1845, . . . . . 282

Note to Art. I., . . . . . 315

# CONTENTS OF No. 202.


Page

ART. I.—1. Patriarchal Order, or Plurality of Wives. By Orson Spencer, Chancellor of the University of Deseret. Liverpool: 1853.

2. The Seer. Edited by Orson Pratt. vol. 1. From January 1853 to December 1853. Washington: 1853.

3. Reports of the Scandinavian, Italian, and Prussian Missions of the Latter Day Saints. Liverpool: 1853.

4. Millennial Star [the Weekly Organ of Mormonism]. vols. XIV. and XV., from January 1852, to December 1853. Liverpool: 1852 and 1853.

5. History of the Mormons. By Lieutenant Gunnison. Philadelphia: 1852.

6. Survey of Utah. By Captain Stansbury. Philadelphia: 1852.

7. The Mormons. Illustrated by Forty Engravings. London: 1852.

8. Letters on the Doctrines. By O. Spencer. London: 1852.

9. Hymns of Latter Day Saints. London: 1851.

10. The Mormons. By Thomas Kane. Philadelphia: 1850.

11. A Bill to establish a Territorial Government for Utah. Washington: 1850.

12. Exposé of Mormonism. By John Bennett. Boston: 1842.

13. Doctrines and Covenants of Latter Day Saints. Nauvoo: 1846.

14. The Book of Mormon. Palmyra: 1830. . . 319

II.—The Works of John Locke. In Nine Volumes, 8vo. London. . . . . 383

III.—1. Histoire des Réfugiés Protestants de France depuis la Revocation de l'Edit de Nantes jusqu'à nos jours. Par M. Ch. Weiss. 2 vols. 12mo. Paris: 1853.

Page

2. Histoire de la Littérature Française à l'étranger depuis le Commencement du 17e Siècle. Par M. A. Sayous. 2 vols. 8vo. Paris: 1853.

3. Histoire Philosophique de l'Académie de Prusse depuis Leibnitz jusqu'à Schelling, particulièrement sous Frédéric le Grand. Par M. Chr. Bartholmès. 2 vols. 8vo. Paris: 1851.

4. History of the Protestants of France, from the Commencement of the Reformation to the present Time. Translated from the French of G. de Félice, D.D. 2 vols. 8vo. London: 1853. . 454

IV.—Memoirs, Journal, and Correspondence of Thomas Moore. Edited by the Right Honourable Lord John Russell, M.P. Vols. I. to VI. 8vo. London: 1853. . . . . . 494

V.—Report from the Select Committee on the National Gallery; together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 4th August [issued December], 1853. . 526

VI.—1. Lorenzo Benoni; or Passages in the Life of an Italian. Edinburgh and London: 1853. 1 vol. 8vo.

2. Castellamonte; an Autobiographical Sketch illustrative of Italian Life during the Insurrection of 1831. 2 vols. post 8vo. London: 1854. . . 557

VII.—1. Copies of the Lord Chancellor's Letters to the Judges on the Criminal Law Bills of the last Session, and Copies of their Answers thereto. Ordered to be printed, 9th February, 1854.

2. A Letter to the Lord Chancellor, containing Observations on the Answers of the Judges to the Lord Chancellor's Letter. By Charles Sprengel Greaves, Esq., Q.C., and James John Lonsdale, Esq., Barrister-at-Law (Secretary to the Common Law Commission). London: W. G. Benning & Co., 1854. . . . . 573

VIII.—1. Statistical Abstract for the United Kingdom in each Year from 1840 to 1853. Presented to both Houses of Parliament.

2. Board of Trade Tables for the Years 1842 to 1853. Presented to both Houses of Parliament. . 581

Note to Article V. of No. CCI. . . 631

THE

# EDINBURGH REVIEW,

JANUARY, 1854.

No. CCI.

ART. I.—1. *Memorials and Correspondence of Charles James Fox.* Edited by LORD JOHN RUSSELL. 2 vols. 8vo. London: 1853.

2. *Memoirs of the Court and Cabinets of George the Third, from original Family Documents.* By the DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM AND CHANDOS, K.G. 2 vols. 8vo. Second edition, revised. London: 1853.

THESE two publications throw so much light on the political history of England during the latter part of the last century, that, although they are both unfinished, we think it right to give our readers an account of their contents, without waiting for their completion.

The late Lord Holland, having abandoned his original design of writing the life of his uncle, Mr. Fox, made a full compilation of authentic materials for his biography, partly consisting of letters and other documents, partly of records of the recollections of his surviving friends. Lord Holland, unhappily, left this compilation unfinished at his death; but it afterwards passed into the hands of his confidential friend, Mr. Allen, who was in every way qualified to complete the work which had been thus begun. Mr. Allen appears to have brought the materials into a state fitted for publication — but the MS. was not sent to the press, and it passed into the possession of Lord John Russell by the bequest of the late Lady Holland. Lord John has now given it to the world in the state in which it was

left by Lord Holland and Mr. Allen, but with the addition of some ably-written and judicious comments of his own. As the work consists of a substratum of original materials, illustrated by the independent annotations of three commentators, which are distinguished by certain typographical marks, it presents (as Lord John observes) 'a disjointed and irregular appearance.' It has the form of a collection of Fox manuscripts, with *variorum* notes. Nevertheless it contains so much authentic information, accompanied with criticism so intelligent and so candid, that no Englishman who desires to understand the history of his country between the years 1768 and 1792, can fail to read it with advantage and pleasure. Lord John, indeed, says of the work which he edits, 'that its greatest value will be found in the 'letters of Mr. Fox to Lord Holland, written between 1790 and '1805. *These letters are more literary than political,* and show 'how keen was Mr. Fox's enjoyment of poetry, especially Greek 'and Italian.' Of the series of letters thus described only a few appear in these volumes; but we think that Lord John scarcely does justice to the value of the documents and papers which he has already published; for many of them are highly important, and the period to which they relate comprises the most active and prominent portion of Fox's political life.*

The materials for the publication to which the name of the Duke of Buckingham is attached, are family papers which have been preserved at Stowe. There are some interesting letters written by Mr. Thomas Grenville when employed in diplomatic service on the Continent; but by far the most valuable portion of the work consists of the letters of Mr. William Grenville (afterwards Lord Grenville) to his elder brother, the Marquis of Buckingham. These letters were evidently written in the strictest confidence, without premeditation, and with no idea that they would ever be given to the public. For this reason they cannot fairly be compared with official or semi-official letters, which are composed in a guarded and reserved style. But, on account of their familiar and unstudied character, they afford the stronger evidence of the sagacity, judgment, and undeviating good temper of their distinguished author. The task of editing the valuable materials which he had extracted from his family archives, has been committed by the Duke of

* There exist two biographical accounts of Mr. Fox. One is intitled 'Memoirs of the Public Life of the late Right Honourable 'C. J. Fox,' by R. Fell, in 2 vols. 8vo. 1808. The other is 'Memoirs 'of the latter Years of the Right Honourable C. J. Fox,' by J. B. Trotter, Esq., late Private Secretary to Mr. Fox. 1 vol. 8vo. 1811. Neither work is at all satisfactory.

Buckingham to some person whose ignorance of the events and persons of the period, and whose consequent incapacity for the work, almost exceed belief. Most of the errors of this scandalously incompetent editor have been already pointed out by a contemporary*; but are nevertheless, with a few exceptions, faithfully reproduced in the new edition.† Before the con-

---

* Thus the strange blunder that the Marquis of Rockingham 'was 'succeeded in his title by his nephew, the Earl Fitzwilliam,' stands uncorrected in vol. i. p. 48. of the new and revised edition. Seeing that the present Earl Fitzwilliam is the son and immediate successor of the Earl Fitzwilliam who is supposed to have inherited the title of Rockingham, it might have occurred to the Editor to doubt the accuracy of his statement.

† Even after the rich harvest of blunders gathered in by the Quarterly Reviewer, a few still remain to be gleaned. Thus in vol. i. p. 185., Lord Grenville, in giving a rumoured list of the Coalition Cabinet, says, 'Lord Keppel to return. Query, whether he is by this 'means to be in the cabinet with Twitcher? I think he should 'appoint *St. Hugh* a Junior Lord.' By *Twitcher* is meant Lord Sandwich, who was supposed to have instigated the court-martial against Lord Keppel. *St. Hugh* is evidently a misprint for *Sir Hugh;* that is, Sir Hugh Palliser, whose bitter feud with Lord Keppel is well known. At the end of the letter, the quotation 'amicitiæ sempiternæ, inimicitiæ placabiles,' is used sarcastically in reference to Fox, who had cited the sentence in the House of Commons as a justification of the Coalition (17. Feb. 1783).

In vol. i. p. 372., the following passage occurs in one of Lord Grenville's letters:— 'We are a little uneasy on account of Tippoo, 'who had made peace with the Mahrattas, and was collecting his 'forces with a view of attacking the Nizam, or the Rajah of *Gravan-* 'core, whom we must protect, or the *Camatre* itself.' For *Gravancore* read *Travancore*, and for *Camatre* read *Carnatic.*

Again in p. 416. 'You have never sent me any answer about the 'Cranbourne *chair* proposal, by which means that business is de- 'layed;' where for *chair* read *chase.*

In vol. ii. p. 52., Wm. Gerard Hamilton is, by the interposition of a comma, divided into two persons, Gerard and Hamilton.

In vol. ii. p. 393., Lord Grenville writes on May 25. 1798, 'O'Connor's acquittal is imputed to *Miller's* charge, and *that* to his 'being completely exhausted, so as to omit some of the most material 'points in the evidence.' Who ever heard of Judge *Miller* at the end of the last century? The reference is to the celebrated case of O'Quigley, Arthur O'Connor, and three others, who were tried for treason at Maidstone, on May 21. and 22. 1798. The judge who summed up was Mr. Justice *Buller;* O'Quigley was convicted, and afterwards hanged; Arthur O'Connor, and the three others, were acquitted.

In the following sentence from a letter written by Lord Grenville,

tinuation of this work is published, we trust that an editor may be found who has heard of the duel between Pitt and Tierney, and who knows that Cuxhaven is not in Ireland.

Mr. Fox was first returned to the Parliament which met on the 10th of May, 1768, being then only nineteen years and four months old. He sat for the borough of Midhurst; his seat having, as it appears, been purchased by his father, Lord Holland. He came into Parliament as a supporter of the Government, of which the Duke of Grafton was then the head; and was, following his father's politics, an eager opponent of Wilkes. He began, even at the age of twenty, to show his remarkable powers of parliamentary debate; and some of his earliest speeches, as we learn from the unwilling testimony of Horace Walpole, produced a strong impression upon the House.* In February 1770—being in his twenty-first year—he accepted

---

in Nov. 1788, a negative appears to be wanting:—'The party in 'general are so hungry and impatient, that I think they will [not?] 'act upon the better judgment of their leaders, and prevent them 'from doing anything which allows a moment's delay.' (Vol. ii. p. 24.)

While the Editor details at length those well-known events which may be found in the 'Annual Register,' or any ordinary history of the time, he omits to explain those less obvious allusions on which a reader is most likely to desire explanation. Thus in vol. i. p. 258., Lord Grenville writes, on May 7. 1783:—'I am in some doubt what 'to do about coming over to you, as on account of *the prince's* 'death, there is no levee to-day, nor, I fear, on Friday.' The prince here alluded to is Prince Octavius, son of George III., who died on May 3. at Kew Palace, of inoculation for the small pox, aged four years.

In vol. ii. p. 63. 'I was a little mortified at finding our friend Sir 'P. P. among them. Sir P. P. is Sir Peter Parker, as appears by a list in a subsequent page, p. 83.

Vol. ii. p. 139. 'Pitt authorises me to say that he could find the 'means of opening a ten shilling government for him in England 'immediately.' A ten shilling government is a small military command with a pay of ten shillings per diem.

Vol. ii. p. 377. In a letter of May 3. 1797, Lord Grenville says to Lord Buckingham, — 'Have you seen *my Prince?* He is sensible 'and well-informed, though not exactly the picture of a young lover.' The Prince alluded to is the Prince of Wirtemberg, who was married to the Princess Royal on May 13. 1797, and whose figure, of extraordinary obesity, was certainly not that of a young lover.

* Both Fox and Pitt showed their uncommon powers of parliamentary speaking from their earliest attempts. Sir R. Walpole, on the other hand, who for courage, readiness, and dexterity in debate, was afterwards second to none, failed in his first speech. See 'Lord 'Mahon's History,' vol. i. p. 265. Ed. 12mo.

the office of a Junior Lord of the Admiralty, shortly after the appointment of Lord North as First Minister, upon the resignation of the Duke of Grafton.* In the Session of 1772, Mr. Fox made a motion for the repeal of the Marriage Act; on which occasion Horace Walpole—a witness whose language must not always be construed strictly—gives the following account.

'When he had moved this repeal, he had not read the Marriage Act, nor did he till some days after. A few evenings before he had been at Brompton on two errands; one, to consult Justice Fielding on the penal laws, the other to borrow 10,000*l.*, which he brought to town at the hazard of being robbed. As the gaming and extravagance of young men of quality had arrived now at a pitch never heard of, it is worth while to give some account of it. They had a club at Almack's, in Pall Mall, where they played only for rouleaus of 50*l.* each, and generally there was 10,000*l.* in specie on the table. Lord Holland had paid above 20,000*l.* for his two sons. Nor were the manners of the gamesters, or even their dresses for play, undeserving notice. They began by pulling off their embroidered clothes and put on frieze great coats, or turned their coats inside outwards for luck. They put on pieces of leather (such as are worn by footmen when they clean the knives) to save their laced ruffles; and to guard their eyes from the light, and to prevent tumbling their hair, wore high-crowned straw hats with broad brims, and adorned with flowers and ribbons; masks to conceal their emotions when they played at quinze. Each gamester had a small neat stand by him to hold their tea, or a wooden bowl with an edge of ormolu to hold their rouleaus. They borrowed great sums of Jews at exorbitant premiums. Charles Fox called his outward room, where those Jews waited till he rose, his Jerusalem Chamber.' (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. i. p. 70.)

On the 20th of February 1772, Fox, being then in his twenty-third year, resigned his seat at the Admiralty Board. His resignation was due, partly to some personal discontent with Lord North, but chiefly to his intention of opposing the Royal Marriage Act, a measure then in preparation, much desired by the King, but reluctantly adopted by his Ministers. While the Bill was pending in Parliament, the King wrote to Lord North in the following terms:—'I expect every nerve to 'be strained to carry the Bill. It is not a question relating to 'administrations, *but personally to myself;* therefore I have a 'right to expect a hearty support from every one in my service, '*and I shall remember defaulters.*' It is evident from the King's language that no person who voted against this Bill could

* The popular belief that Lord Bute continued to exercise a secret influence over the King, after his retirement from office, is, we may remark, conclusively refuted by the evidence adduced in vol. i. pp. 65—68. of the 'Memorials of Fox.'

continue to hold office under the Crown. Fox took an active part in opposing it during its passage through the House of Commons. 'In the course of the debates (says Horace 'Walpole) I have given very inadequate ideas of the speeches 'of Burke, Charles Fox, and Wedderburne, three excellent 'orators in different ways. Burke's wit, allusions, and enthu- 'siasm were striking, but not imposing; Wedderburne was a 'sharp, clever arguer, though unequal; Charles Fox, much 'younger than either, was universally allowed to have seized 'the just point of argument throughout with most amazing 'rapidity and clearness, and to have excelled even Charles 'Townshend as a Parliament man, though inferior in wit and 'variety of talents.'

Fox afterwards introduced his Bill for amending the Marriage Act: it was opposed by Lord North and by Burke, and was ultimately thrown out. Walpole's account of Burke's speech against this Bill is remarkable with reference to his subsequent career.

'Burke made a fine and long oration against the motion. 'Burke was certainly in his principles no moderate man; and 'when his party did not interfere, generally leaned to the more 'arbitrary side, as had appeared in the late debates on the Church, 'in which he had declared for the clergy. . . . He spoke with a 'choice and variety of language, a profusion of metaphors, and 'yet with a correction of diction that were surprising. His 'fault was copiousness above measure; and he dealt abundantly, 'too much, in establishing general positions. *Two-thirds of this 'oration resembled the beginning of a book on speculative doctrines, 'and yet argument was not the forte of it.*'

This first breach between Mr. Fox and Lord North was not of long duration; for in December of the same year 1772, an arrangement was made, by which the former returned to office and became a junior Lord of the Treasury. His habits of deep play, however, unhappily continued unbroken, and in order to pay his gaming debts, he actually incurred liabilities to the enormous amount of 140,000*l.*, which sum was discharged by his father from his own estate.* A strange story is likewise told by Horace

* The following curious account of the occurrences of this time given to Lord Holland in 1823, by Lord Egremont, is worthy of attention by all persons who are in the habit of high play. 'Lord 'Egremont was convinced,' he said, 'by reflection, aided by his 'subsequent experience of the world, that there was at that time 'some unfair confederacy among some of the players, and that the 'great losers, especially Mr. Fox, were actually duped and cheated; 'he should, he said, have been torn to pieces, and stoned by the

Walpole (the truth of which is recognised by Lord Holland) of his having been at this time duped by an impostor calling herself the *Hon. Mrs. Grieve*, who undertook to procure for him as wife, a Miss Phipps, recently arrived from the West Indies, with a fortune of 80,000*l.*

In the session of 1774, Mr. Fox, impatient of the restraints to which a member holding a subordinate office is subject, differed from Lord North and took an independent line with respect to the committal of Woodfall the printer for a breach of privilege. The King, who appears to have conceived a personal dislike to Fox on account of his opposition to the Royal Marriage Bill, was much displeased at his conduct on this occasion, and on February 15th, wrote thus to Lord North: —

'I am greatly incensed at the presumption of Charles Fox in 'forcing you to vote with him last night, but approve much of 'the making your friends vote in the majority. Indeed, that 'young man has so strongly cast off every principle of common 'honour and honesty, that he must become as contemptible as 'he is odious. I hope you will let him know that you are not 'insensible of his conduct towards you.'*

On a subsequent stage of the same proceeding, Fox repeated his insubordination to Lord North, who, in consequence, sent him a laconic letter, informing him that he was no longer a Lord

---

'losers themselves, for hinting such a thing at the time, and even 'now, those of them, himself excepted, who survived, would exclaim 'at such a supposition; but he was nevertheless satisfied, that the 'immoderate, constant, and unparalleled advantages over Charles Fox, 'and other young men, were not to be accounted for merely by the 'difference of passing or holding the box, or the hazard of the dice. 'He had indeed no suspicions (any more than the rest had) at the 'time, but he had thought it much over since, and he now had.'

* George III. commented very freely on the public men whom he disliked, in his letters to Lord North. Thus in a letter of Aug. 1775, he speaks of Lord Chatham's recent political conduct as 'abandoned'; he describes Lord Chatham as totally devoid of the honourable sentiment of gratitude, and calls him 'a trumpet of sedition.' (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. i. p. 129.) In letters of the 16th of March, 1778, he speaks of 'Lord Chatham and his crew;' and calls him 'that perfidious 'man.' It seems to be ascertained that George III. had an attack of insanity (concealed from the public) so early as the year 1765. See 'Adolphus's Hist. of the Reign of Geo. III.' vol. i. p. 175. ed. 1840; 'Lord Mahon's History,' vol. v. p. 26. Nevertheless, the letters of Lord Grenville during the King's illness in 1788–9 (in the Buckingham Papers), convince us that the Ministers had, at that time, no suspicion of his having been previously insane. See particularly a letter in vol. ii. p. 5.

of the Treasury. Fox now put an end to his connexion with Lord North, went into Opposition, and began to act with the Rockingham party, though he did not formally join it till 1778 or 9. By this means he became the friend of Burke; a friendship which exercised much influence upon him. His independent political career, after he had broken through his original party ties, may be considered as commencing from 1774, when he was in his 25th year. This year, as Lord John Russell remarks, in an excellent review of our history from 1763 to 1774 (vol. i. p. 102—133.) was the turning point of the American war. It was then that Lord North, though he had originally been adverse to the imposition of the tea duty, decided to maintain it, by closing the port of Boston, and altering the charter of Massachussets. 'In taking this course,' says Lord John, 'Lord North was 'warmly supported in the closet, and received the sympathy 'of the country. Yet it is impossible not to reflect that Lord 'North was the same minister who in 1768 had, by his voice in 'the Cabinet, prevented the repeal of the tea duty, and the 'abandonment of all taxation by Parliament for imperial purposes. * Had he supported that repeal in 1768, he would have 'prevented the American war; in 1774 he at least would have 'given a chance to peace; in 1778, after our armies had been 'defeated, the concession was useless and insufficient.'

Fox, from the time that he separated himself from Lord North, carried on an unremitting opposition to the American war. His speeches, always marked by decided ability, had hitherto been desultory and occasional; but he now (as Gibbon said) discovered powers for regular debate, which neither his friends hoped, nor his enemies dreaded. Mr. Grattan (as we learn from Lord John), who had heard Mr. Fox at various epochs, declared his preference for the speeches delivered during the American war, to all the other efforts of his eloquence. His denunciations of Ministers and their policy were conveyed in the strongest language. Thus in 1777 he described Lord G. Germaine, as

* The division in the Cabinet of 5 to 4, by which it was decided to maintain the tea duty, was not in 1768, but on the 1st of May, 1769. See Lord 'Mahon's History,' vol. v. p. 242, and Ap. p. xxxvii. The votes were as follows:—

| *For repeal.* | *Against it.* |
|---|---|
| Duke of Grafton. | Lord President. |
| Lord Chancellor Camden. | Lord North. |
| Lord Granby. | Lord Rochford. |
| Gen. Conway. | Lord Hillsborough. |
| | Lord Weymouth. |

On such slight circumstances do great events sometimes turn.

'that inauspicious and ill-omened character, whose arrogance and 'presumption, whose ignorance and inability,' had brought evil upon the country.* Horace Walpole says, that on the budget in 1778, 'Charles Fox poured out the bitterest and one of the 'finest of all his philippics against Lord North, taxing him with 'breach of honour in having declared that he would resign if 'his first conciliatory proposition had not the desired effect; 'that he had broken his word, that he had this year brought 'measures of the same kind, at which he confessed he felt 'humbled, though not ashamed; if such measures did not make 'him blush, what would? And in this style he spoke for above 'half an hour.'

The following curious account of a scene in an American debate in 1777 occurs in a letter of Mr. Crawford (better known by his prenomen of *Fish*) to Lord Ossory: —

'Charles [Fox] spoke with great violence, but the House this time went along with him. We were not shocked at his talking of bringing Lord George [Germaine] to a *second* trial, nor were we shocked at being asked if we could patiently continue to submit to see this nation disgraced by him in *every* capacity.† There were high words between Wedderburne and Burke, which so offended the latter that he went out of the House, and, I believe, intended to challenge Wedderburne, but was prevented by a letter from Wedderburne, and an explanation likewise, which he sent him through Charles. In the midst of Wedderburne's speaking, Burke burst into one of his loud hysterical laughs. Unfortunately at that moment there was a dead silence in the House. Wedderburne, in a very angry tone, said, that if that gentleman did not know manners, he, as an individual, would teach them to him; that he had not the good will of that gentleman, and did not wish for it, but he was ambitious of having even his respect, and would force it from him, &c. This the other construed into a menace. . . . . I have given this imperfect description of a quarrel, which is very well settled on both sides. Burke was origi-

* On this occasion 'Lord North handsomely defended Lord 'George, and said he was glad Fox had abandoned him, an old hulk, 'to attack a man of war; but afterwards he perhaps hurt Lord George 'as much as Fox had done, for the latter coming up to the Treasury 'benches, Lord North said, in Lord George's hearing, "Charles, I am '"glad you did not fall on me to-day, for you was in full feather."' (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. i. p. 159.) This anecdote proves the private familiarity which still subsisted between Lord North and Fox, notwithstanding their political differences.

† The allusion is to Lord G. Germaine's conduct at the battle of Minden, in 1759, for which he was dismissed by Mr. Pitt from all his military employments, and was declared by a court-martial to have been guilty of disobeying orders, and to be unfit to serve his Majesty in any military capacity whatever.

nally in the wrong, because nothing could be more uncivil than his laugh appeared to be, from the accident of the dead silence of the House at that moment.' (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. i. p. 162.)

The efforts of the Opposition in denouncing the policy of Lord North's Government were not unavailing, for in a letter to Lord Ossory of November 29. 1777, Fox says, 'I am clear the 'opinion of the majority of the House is with us. I cannot help 'flattering myself that opinions will, in the long run, have their 'influence on votes.' A few months later (February, 1778) he uses the following remarkable expressions respecting himself in a letter to his intimate friend Fitzpatrick, who was then in America:—

'I think I have given you enough of politics, considering I have nothing but reports and conjectures to give you. With respect to my own share, I can only say that people flatter me that I continue to gain, rather than lose, my credit as an orator; and I am so convinced that this is all that I ever shall gain (unless I choose to become the meanest of men) that I never think of any other object of ambition. I am certainly ambitious by nature, but I really have, or think I have, totally subdued that passion. I have still as much vanity as ever, which is a happier passion by far; because great reputation I think I may acquire and keep, great situation I never can acquire nor, if acquired, keep, without making sacrifices that I never will make. If I am wrong, and more sanguine people right, *tant mieux*, and I shall be as happy as they can be; but if I am right, I am sure I shall be the happier, for having made up my mind to my situation.'

The influence, however, which Fox had gained in the House by his speeches against the Ministry, and the waning popularity of the war since the reverses of our arms, especially after the surrender of Saratoga in October 1777, led to a negotiation with Fox in March 1778, to induce him to join Lord North's Ministry. This negotiation (to which the King's consent had doubtless been obtained) was conducted by Mr. Eden (afterwards Lord Auckland), whose account of his interview of three hours with Fox is now published. Fox is reported to have said, 'that except with Lord G. Germaine, he could act with the 'existing Ministers; but he disavowed every possibility of 'accepting singly and alone, and even doubted whether he 'could accept in any case.' 'I am convinced,' adds Mr. Eden, 'that he will make no bad use of the conversation, but in other 'respects will be as hostile as ever.' A similar overture was made at the same time, through Mr. Eden, to Lord Shelburne, whose chief political connexion was with Lord Chatham; and through him an attempt was made to ascertain the terms upon which Lord Chatham would join the Government. It is, how-

ever, evident that the King did not meditate any fundamental change of policy, or any real concession to the views of the Opposition. He was ready to engraft men of ability into the Ministry, but merely with a view of strengthening it, not of altering its measures. This appears clearly from a curious passage in Mr. Eden's account of his interview with Lord Shelburne. In the course of a discussion on certain changes of office, Lord Shelburne had made the remark, that 'surely there 'would be some mode of doing everything right, without doing 'anything harsh.'

'This,' says Mr. Eden, 'gave me the opening I wished, to enter fully, and in the plainest language, into the narrowness, nonsense, and harshness of the whole proposition, so far as implied a wish and expectation in his lordship's friend at Hayes [Lord Chatham] to avail himself of the pressure of a moment in order to dictate terms to the closet, every part of which would imply a desertion and disavowal of servants who for many years had fought the cause of their master, of the Parliament, and of the whole nation, with the most cordial fidelity and zeal; and this, too, upon principles of the purest kind, the truth of which remains unimpaired, though mischances and circumstances may make it more difficult to enforce them. I added, that though uninformed and unauthorised as to any specific resolutions taken, I could argue safely from the sentiments of honour which I knew to be firmly rooted, and could at once say *that no arrangement could or would ever be listened to one moment except on the ground of mere accession of capacity and business*, in a moment which would require great exertions, and that even such accessions could not be taken, unless made in a plan consistent with the honour of all that had passed heretofore.' (Vol. i. p. 185.)*

The limited extent of the King's views in consenting to these negotiations, and his resolution to continue the anti-American policy, so long as he could find Ministers who would support him, are fully displayed in his letters to Lord North at this period. In a letter of the 16th of March, 1778, he thus expresses himself: 'I will only add, *to put before your eyes my*

* Concerning this negotiation through Lord Shelburne with Lord Chatham, see 'Lord Mahon's History,' c. 57. vol. vi. p. 223—226. Lord Mahon remarks:— 'It is certain that the object of the King 'was at this juncture wholly unattainable, that if Lord North 'retired as not willing or not able to carry his system further, *no 'other administration on the same system could be formed.*' This opinion seems to us perfectly correct, but the plan of a coalition can hardly be called 'the King's object.' It was the King's aversion; and he was only willing to consent to it on terms which rendered it impossible.

'*most inward thoughts*, that no advantage to this country, nor 'personal danger to myself, can ever make me address myself to 'Lord Chatham, or any other branch of Opposition. Honestly, 'I would rather lose the crown I now wear than bear the 'ignominy of possessing it under their shackles.' On the following day he writes thus: 'My dear Lord, no consideration in 'life shall make me stoop to Opposition. I am still ready to 'accept any part of them that will come to the assistance of my 'present efficient Ministers; but whilst any ten men in the 'kingdom will stand by me, I will not give myself up to bondage. My dear Lord, I will rather risk my crown than do what 'I think personally disgraceful. It is impossible this nation 'should not stand by me. If they will not, they shall have 'another king; for I never will put my hand to what will make 'me miserable to the last hour of my life.' On the 22nd, the King says: 'I will never consent to removing the members of 'the present Cabinet from my service;' and on the 29th he puts this question to Lord North: 'Do you think it possible to 'strengthen the present Administration by an accession of 'some men of talents from the Opposition?' He then adds: 'If that cannot be effected, will you consent to continue, and 'try to exert yourself, and co-operate with me in putting vigour 'and activity to every department.' Again, on the 29th of January, 1779, the King addresses Lord North in the same strain: 'I perceive, as I expected, that Opposition, when they 'talk of conditions, mean to dictate. I thank God, whatever 'difficulties may surround me, I am not made of materials to 'stoop to that.' And on the 4th February: 'My conduct 'will show that I never am deaf to any apparent proposals of 'general union, though no circumstances shall ever compel me 'to be dictated to by Opposition.'

If George III. had understood his position as a constitutional king, he would at this time have consented to form a new Ministry from the leaders of Opposition, and have acquiesced, without querulous and undignified protestations, in a policy which in a few years was forced upon his acceptance by the general feeling of the country, and at the point of the Parliamentary bayonet.

Lord Holland remarks upon these declarations, that 'the 'King was willing to employ any one who would concur with 'him in his efforts to reduce the revolted colonies to obedience, 'but would not accept the services of Opposition, because the 'Opposition thought that object unattainable, and were ready 'to acknowledge the independence of the United States. The 'result is, that it was the King at that period, and the King

'only, who prevented a coalition of parties, and peace with 'America.' From this view Lord J. Russell justly, as we think, dissents: 'I cannot,' he says, 'concur in this last remark. 'The King's determination to carry on the war in all quarters 'of the globe could have had no practical influence had not 'Lord North consented to remain Minister, to carry on a war 'of which he disapproved, and had not a majority of the House 'of Commons supported a system which they believed in their 'hearts to be fraught with danger to the country. The power 'of a single will was indeed conspicuous; but the Constitution 'afforded ample means of overruling that will, had the Minister 'obeyed his own convictions, or had the House of Commons 'been true to the people they represented.'

In the summer of 1779, fresh overtures to the leaders of Opposition were made for the formation of a Coalition Government, in which Lord Weymouth was to be First Lord of the Treasury, and Thurlow Chancellor; Lords North, G. Germaine, Suffolk, Sandwich, Dartmouth, and some others, were to retire, and their places were to be filled up by Lord Rockingham and his friends, or they were to take in the Duke of Grafton, and Lords Camden and Shelburne. This overture was rejected by Lord Rockingham's party, somewhat too hastily and peremptorily, in Mr. Fox's judgment: 'You think,' wrote Mr. Fox to Lord Rockingham, shortly afterwards, 'you can 'best serve the country by continuing a fruitless opposition; '*I think it impossible to serve it at all but by coming into power;* 'and go even so far as to think it irreconcilable with the duty 'of a public man to refuse it, if offered to him in a manner 'consistent with his private honour, and so as to enable him to 'form fair hopes of doing essential service.' The wisdom of this refusal is most ably vindicated in an admirable letter from the Duke of Richmond to Mr. Fox, which its length prevents us from extracting, but which we strongly commend to the reader's attentive perusal. (Vol. i. p. 213.) The Duke of Richmond shows that the offer was too vague for acceptance; and that the Whigs, who might have joined the Government, would have had no security that their principles would be acted on. 'If,' he says, 'we are not to make the arrangement, and 'are yet to be supposed to have the management of affairs, it 'becomes surely not only fair, but necessary, that we should 'have a specific description of that share of Government pro- 'posed for us, which is to give us the means, weight, and 'authority to carry our measures; or if it is not intended that 'we are to direct the measures, it is necessary we should have 'a precise idea of those to which we are called to accede.

'*Without one of these, it is merely an offer of places without* '*power, under a bargain to screen those whom we have been so* '*long condemning.* Such an offer I am sure you will approve 'of our rejecting with indignation.' It is evident, from what we now know of the King's feelings, that if Lord Rockingham and his friends had met this overture with a less decided refusal at the threshold, and had shown a willingness to entertain the proposal, they would speedily have found that the King was only willing to admit them on terms inconsistent with their principles and personal honour, and that the negotiation would have immediately come to an end. Thus far we assent to the view so well enforced in the Duke of Richmond's letter; at the same time we think, with Fox, that it was a most important matter for the interests of the country at that moment to break up Lord North's Government, which object would have been accomplished, if several of the Whig leaders could have been introduced into the Cabinet without compromising their principles; and although we do not believe that the King would have allowed an Administration so constituted to remain in power for six months, we deem it highly improbable that, in the existing state of public affairs, he would have been able to resuscitate as bad a Government as that which continued in Office until 1782.

In the summer of 1780, soon after Lord G. Gordon's riots, overtures for a junction were again made to Lord Rockingham through Mr. Frederic Montague.* In a memorandum of instructions for this negotiation, found among Lord North's papers, it is stated: 'No difficulty about Dukes of Portland 'and Manchester, Mr. Townshend, Mr. Burke, and Mr. Fox; 'but Lord [North] advises that Mr. Fox should at first be pro-'posed for an office that would not lead immediately to the 'closet.' The leaders of Opposition entertained this proposal, and offered to treat upon certain conditions, of which the two following were the most important.

'1. The American war requires no discussion, as they did 'not see how the troops could be recalled from thence, and the 'dependence of America need not at present be taken into con-'sideration.'

'2. That some public measures must be admitted to enable 'them to coalesce with reputation, such as Mr. Crewe's Bill,

* Mr. Frederic Montague, of Papplewick Hall, in Nottinghamshire, sat for Northampton, and afterwards for Higham Ferrers. He was a prominent member of the Rockingham party, and was one of the seven commissioners named in Fox's India Bill.

'the Contractors' Bill, and a part, if not the whole, of Mr. 'Burke's Bill.'

As soon, however, as the King was made aware of these conditions, the negotiation received its *quietus* from the following remarks addressed by His Majesty, in his own royal style of composition, to Lord North:—

'The evasive answer about America will by no means answer. Indeed, upon all constitutional points, the Opposition have run so wild, that it is absolutely necessary for those who come into office to give assurances that they do not mean to be hampered by the tenets they have held during their opposition. The second proposition is therefore quite inadmissible.

'The Duke of Richmond and Mr. Fox have, more avowedly than any others of the Rockingham party, dipped themselves, for they have added, shortening the duration of Parliaments, and the former, by a strange conceit of changing the whole mode and right of election, would materially alter the Constitution. This, added to his unremitted personal ill conduct to me, it cannot be expected that I should express any wish of seeing him in my service. *Persons must atone for their faults before I can attempt to forgive them.* The Duke of Richmond has not put his foot into my apartments for seven years, but not content with this, sent me a message by Lord Weymouth, that though he never came near to me, he, as a Lieutenant-General, asked my leave to go to France. As to Mr. Fox, if any lucrative, not ministerial office, can be pointed out for him, provided he will support the Ministry, I shall have no objection to the proposition. He never had any principle, and can therefore act as his interest may guide him.

'The Duke of Portland I should with pleasure see in my service. Ireland, or any great Court office, would, I hope, suit him. The Duke of Manchester, in a lucrative office, I should not object to. Messrs. Townshend and Burke would be real acquisitions.' (Vol. i. p. 252.)

During all this time, Lord North was secretly disinclined to the policy on which his Government had been acting; he was desirous of resigning his post of Prime Minister, and only retained it in deference to the King's wishes. Ample evidence of this fact is furnished in the work before us. The following extract, from a letter of Lord North to the King, contains a most extraordinary confession of the state of his mind on the subject. The conversation took place in October 1779; and Lord North remained in office more than two years longer.

'Lord Gower [President of the Council] came to Lord North to inform him that he had long felt the utmost uneasiness at the situation of his Majesty's affairs; that nothing can be so weak as the Government; that nothing is done; that there was no discipline in the state, the army, or the navy; and that impending ruin must be

the consequence of the present system of government; that he thought himself obliged, as well in conscience as in wisdom, to desire an immediate dismissal from his employment; that he had no connexion with any of the members of the Opposition, which he thought as wicked as the Administration is weak; that nothing can afford the least hope but a coalition, and he is afraid that even that remedy may be too late; that he feels the greatest gratitude for the many marks of royal goodness which he has received, but that he does not think it the duty of a faithful servant to endeavour to preserve a system which must end in the ruin of his Majesty and of the country. He is determined never again to take office, but to support Government in his private capacity. Lord North thinks that Lord Gower's resignation at the present moment must be the ruin of Administration. In Lord North's arguments with Lord Gower, Lord North owns that he had certainly one disadvantage, *which is that he holds in his heart, and has held for these three years, just the same opinion with Lord Gower.*' (Vol. i. p. 245.)

In commenting on this remarkable declaration, Lord Holland and Mr. Allen 'lament Lord North's weakness, but enter into 'the *chivalrous feelings* of Lord North, which induced him, in 'opposition to his better judgment, not to abandon a master 'who expressed for him such confidence, affection, and regard.' From this opinion Lord John Russell dissents, and supports his dissent by the following just and discriminating remarks: —

'The King held that the acknowledgment of the independence of America would place this country in a state of inferiority, and be tantamount to its ruin as a great and powerful state. Lord Chatham had held an opinion very similar to this. Lord Shelburne, following his leader, said in the House of Lords, that when America became independent, the sun of England would set. *The sovereign was only blameable for the obstinacy with which he clung to an opinion entertained by some of the most sagacious and eminent of his subjects.* Lord North's position was different; he was disposed to conciliate America, had sent commissioners for that purpose, and was quite ready to consent to peace. For three years he had been of opinion that his own ministry was feeble, and would effect no good purpose. Why, then, did he remain? *To carry into effect the personal wishes of the sovereign, which he preferred to the welfare of the State.* This may be Toryism; but it is not patriotic, still less is it constitutional, conduct.' (Vol. i. p. 247.)

As the war proceeded, and its failures accumulated; moreover, as the ability with which its management was attacked by the Opposition, and the weakness with which it was defended by Ministers, became more conspicuous, a change in public opinion was gradually produced, which began to be felt in the votes of the House of Commons. The first decided symptom of this change was the result of the famous motion of

Dunning—'That the influence of the Crown has increased, is 'increasing, and ought to be diminished'—which, after a hot debate, was carried, on the 6th of April, 1780, by 233 to 215 votes. In the mean time, the pretensions of the Opposition, and their indisposition to such a compromise as they had recently been willing to accept, naturally increased. In writing to his friend Fitzpatrick, in September, 1781, Mr. Fox says:—'The 'more I think of the whole of the business, the more I feel 'averse to coming in upon any terms, unless on those of parlia- 'mentary condemnation of what is past.' Nothing of this sort was hinted at in the negotiation, through Mr. Fred. Montague, in the summer of the previous year. A few days before the fall of Lord North's Ministry, Fox used language in the House of Commons which showed that he kept no measures with the Court. In the debate on General Conway's motion for peace with America, on February 22. 1782, Welbore Ellis, the new American Secretary, made an unmeaning speech, which disclosed no decided views. 'Jenkinson,' says Horace Walpole, 'was less oracular, and Charles Fox accordingly applied a much 'harsher comment on him, as one who was the mouth of the 'oracle, of which Ellis was only the statue; but as if Fox had 'embraced all the notions that had been held about oracles (to 'which indeed he did not even allude), he mentioned the *infernal* '*spirit* that really ruled and had nearly ruined the country.' But notwithstanding the increasing confidence of the Opposition, the King persisted, as long as he could keep a Ministry together, in refusing his consent to the independence of the revolted colonies. Thus even on the 26th of December, 1781, he is careful to impress on Lord North that there is 'no change 'in his sentiments on the essential point, namely, the getting 'a peace at the expense of a separation from America, which no 'difficulties can get him to consent to.' Even when the overthrow of Lord North's Ministry, by adverse votes of the House of Commons, was imminent, the King still held to his intention of excluding the Opposition from power. 'Certain it is,' says Walpole, 'nothing could exceed the aversion of the King, not 'to parting with his minister, but to accepting one by force. 'All his arts,—little ones, indeed,—were employed to avoid 'that humiliation; and though he succeeded in the only artifice 'in which he ever had succeeded—sowing division, yet he not 'only avoided no mortification, but laid a foundation for receiving 'much greater.' He even talked of returning to Hanover, and directions were given to prepare the royal yacht for his transport to the Continent. This intention seems to have been in

his mind when, on the 17th of March, three days before Lord North's resignation, he addressed to his Prime Minister the following mysterious words:—'I am resolved not to throw 'myself into the hands of Opposition, at all events, and shall 'certainly, if things go as they seem to tend, know what my 'conscience as well as honour dictates, *as the only way left* '*for me.*'

Lord North's resignation, involving the dissolution of his Ministry, and the pacification with America, took place on the 20th of March, 1782. The following lively account of the scene which passed that night in the House of Commons is left by Lord Holland:—

'I have heard my uncle Fitzpatrick give a very diverting account of the scene that passed in the House of Commons on the day of Lord North's resignation, which happened to be a remarkable cold day, with a fall of snow. A motion of Lord Surrey's, for the dismissal of Ministers, stood for that day, and the Whigs were anxious that it should come on before the resignation of Lord North was officially announced, that his removal from office might be more manifestly and formally the act of the House of Commons. He and Lord Surrey rose at the same instant; after much clamour, disorder, and some insignificant speeches on order, Mr. Fox, with great quickness and address, moved, as the most regular method of extricating the House from its embarrassment, "That Lord Surrey be now heard." But Lord North, with yet more admirable presence of mind, mixed with pleasantry, rose immediately and said, "I rise to speak to that "motion;" and, as his reason for opposing it, stated his resignation and the dissolution of the Ministry. The House, satisfied, became impatient, and after some ineffectual efforts of speakers on both sides to procure a hearing, an adjournment took place. Snow was falling, and the night tremendous. All the members' carriages were dismissed, and Mrs. Bennet's room at the door was crowded. But Lord North's carriage was waiting. He put into it one or two of his friends, whom he had invited to go home with him, and turning to the crowd, chiefly composed of his bitter enemies, in the midst of their triumph, exclaimed, in this hour of defeat and supposed mortification, with admirable good humour and pleasantry, "I have my "carriage. You see, gentlemen, the advantage of being in the "secret. Good night."' (Vol. i. p. 295.)*

The history of the formation of the new Ministry is not a little remarkable, and clearly explains its internal feebleness and speedy extinction. The King began by applying, through the Chancellor Thurlow, to Lord Rockingham, as leader of the principal section of the Whigs, in order to learn the terms upon

* The same story is told in Wraxall's 'Historical Memoirs,' vol. ii. p. 607., ed. 1836.

which he would undertake to form an administration.* These were, in substance, the independence of America, and measures for diminishing the influence of the Crown. Unwilling to capitulate on these terms, the King next made an attempt to induce Lord Gower to undertake the formation of a government; but without success. In his letter authorising this application, he declared that 'he could never submit to a total change without 'abandoning his principles and honour, which he would never 'do.' The King then sent for Lord Shelburne, and asked him to form a government; he declined the offer, and advised the King to prefer Lord Rockingham†: a fact which he did not then disclose, but which he stated in the House of Lords after Lord Rockingham's death‡, and which was also mentioned at the same time by the King to Mr. Fox.§ In the first interview nothing was arranged, but three days afterwards the King sent again for Lord Shelburne, who returned, bringing an offer of the Treasury to Lord Rockingham, and full powers to treat, both as to men and measures; he himself was to be a Secretary of State. Lord Rockingham at first hesitated as to the propriety of accepting an offer made in so indirect and mistrustful a manner; but upon consultation with Mr. Fox and other friends, he decided (perhaps unwisely‖) not to reject it. He accom-

---

* The particulars of this negotiation through Lord Thurlow, are given in Lord Albemarle's 'Memoirs of Lord Rockingham,' vol. ii.

† Lord Mahon, vol. vi. p. 397., gives the following extract from the Duke of Grafton's Memoirs respecting the failure of the negotiation with the Opposition in 1779, already mentioned:—'This circumstance cemented the Opposition into a more solid body, and 'furnished the means, that Lord Camden and I improved, by persuading Lord Shelburne not to contest with Lord Rockingham the 'Treasury, in case a new administration was to be formed. Lord 'Shelburne yielded the point with a better grace than I had expected.'

‡ July 10. 1782.

§ Memorials of Fox, vol. i. p. 436. Bishop Watson, in the anecdotes of his Life, says:—'Lord Rockingham told me that Lord 'Shelburne had behaved very honourably to him in not accepting the 'Treasury, which the King had offered to him in preference to Lord 'Rockingham.' (P. 93. 4to.)

‖ After the resignation of the Shelburne Administration, the King applied to Lord North, who declined to undertake the formation of a Ministry himself, and advised the King to apply to the Duke of Portland. 'Lord North,' says H. Walpole, 'proposed to the King to see 'the Duke of Portland himself; but that the King refused, and told 'Lord North to desire the Duke to send him his arrangement in 'writing. This was as positively refused by the Duke, who sent

panied his acceptance, however, with a list of the Cabinet, in which he was himself First Lord of the Treasury, and Mr. Fox and Lord Shelburne the Secretaries of State. The office of Chancellor was alone left open. On the same evening a large meeting of members of the House of Commons was held at the house of Mr. T. Townshend, to which this list was submitted. The list, having been approved by this meeting, was sent to Lord Shelburne, who agreed to the arrangement, and communicated the names to the King. Lord Shelburne had a long interview with the King on the following day, and then went to Mr. Fox to inform him that the proposals were substantially adopted. At this interview Mr. Fox told Lord Shelburne that he perceived this Administration was to consist of two parts,—one belonging to the King, the other to the public. Lord Thurlow continued as Chancellor, and Mr. Dunning, created Lord Ashburton, was added to the Cabinet, upon the suggestion of Lord Shelburne, without previous communication with Lord Rockingham.

It thus appears that the King, though he prudently yielded to the pressure of a parliamentary majority, and abandoned his intention of retiring to Hanover, yet bowed his neck under the yoke of Opposition with visible reluctance. He refused to see his future Prime Minister until he was actually in office; and by giving his chief apparent confidence to another member of the Cabinet, he laid the foundation of discord and distrust in the Government from its very commencement. The seed thus carefully sown began soon to germinate. Even as early as the 28th of April—about a month after the formation of the Government—Mr. Fox writes as follows to Fitzpatrick:—

'Shelburne shows himself more and more every day; is ridiculously jealous of my encroaching on his department, and wishes very much to encroach upon mine. He hardly liked my having a letter from Grattan, or my having written one to Lord Charlemont.* He affects the Minister more and more every day, and is, I believe, perfectly confident that the King intends to make him so. Provided we can stay in long enough to have given a good stout blow to the in-

---

'word that if his Majesty condescended to employ him, it would be 'necessary for him to see his Majesty.' (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. ii. p. 49.) It ended by the King seeing the Duke of Portland, and his becoming Prime Minister. The above account is confirmed by Lord Grenville's relation of his interview with the King, who showed him the correspondence with Lord North and the Duke of Portland. (*Buckingham Papers*, vol. i. p. 213.)

* As Lord Shelburne was Home Secretary, the Irish business was in his department.

fluence of the Crown, I do not think it much signifies how soon we go out after, and leave him and the Chancellor to make such a government as they can; and this I think we shall be able to do.' (Vol. i. p. 316.)

The practical working of our Government has undergone so great a change since 1780, notwithstanding the preservation of its forms, that it is important not to misunderstand the true character of the struggle which was terminated by the overthrow of Lord North's Ministry. It was a struggle of the King's personal will, supported by the influence of the Crown, against the independent portion of the House of Commons. The war against the insurgent colonies had at first been highly popular*; but a succession of disasters turned the tide of public feeling, and the country were ready to adopt the views of all the ablest men in both Houses of Parliament, who recommended either large concessions, or entire independence. But the King remained unmoved: he would not consent to a dismemberment of the Empire; and he found in Lord North and his colleagues Ministers who were ready to persist in the policy to which he adhered, even when it was contrary to their own convictions. Against this Ministry, Fox, Burke, and other powerful speakers, thundered night after night, denouncing their principles, conduct, motives, and capacity in the most vehement language, and sometimes directing their fire over the Treasury Bench at the Throne. When the battle was over, Fox openly treated it as a victory of the House of Commons over the King. On the night when Lord North announced his resignation, he said, that 'as the House had now proved their abhorrence of a 'Government of influence, the new Ministers must ever bear 'in mind that fact, and *remember that to the House they owed* '*their situations.*' Moreover, before the list of the proposed Cabinet was presented to the King, it had been submitted to a meeting of the Whig party, and had received their sanction. By placing the question on this issue, George III. abandoned the secure, dignified, and neutral position of a constitutional king, and entered upon the perilous career of a party-leader. He protested against changing his principles, threw out obscure threats of abdicating the throne, and staked his political reputation against Fox and the leaders of Opposition. The result was, that he underwent the humiliation of a personal defeat; but he had sufficient prudence to tolerate for a time a Ministry composed of men whom he regarded as his personal enemies,

* See Lord Mahon, vol. vi. p. 68.

rather than attempt some act of unconstitutional violence, or bring the machine of Government to a stand-still.

The Rockingham Ministry lasted just three months. Lord North resigned on the 20th of March. Lord Rockingham died on the 1st of July.* Two days after his death, Mr. Fox advised the King to appoint as his successor some member of the Rockingham party. The King announced his intention of preferring Lord Shelburne, to whom Fox objected; but the King adhered to his resolution, and Fox, followed by Lord John Cavendish, with Burke, Sheridan, and others not in the Cabinet, resigned. Lord Shelburne then became Prime Minister, with Pitt as Chancellor of the Exchequer and Leader of the House of Commons. Lord Keppel, General Conway, and the Duke of Richmond, the other three members of the Rockingham party in the Cabinet, retained their offices, and did not go out with Fox.

Among the Rockingham Whigs, the Duke of Richmond considered himself as having the first claim to the post of Prime Minister. He was, however, rejected by his friends on account of his extreme opinions on Parliamentary Reform; and Mr. Fox, as being his kinsman†, was employed to impart to him the unwelcome intelligence, which he executed thus: 'We must (he 'said) settle without delay whom to propose as the successor of 'Lord Rockingham; and as *you and I* are both out of the 'question, owing to the decided part we have taken about 'Parliamentary Reform, I think the Duke of Portland should be 'the man.' The Duke of Portland was, however, chiefly recommended for this post by his rank and respectable character; and in point of capacity and fitness for the office of Prime Minister, he was decidedly inferior to Lord Shelburne.

We have been the more particular in describing this change of Administration, because we believe that Fox's decision to separate himself from Lord Shelburne was the turning point of his political life, and exercised an enormous influence upon the subsequent course of events. His motive for this decision was his distrust of Lord Shelburne, whom he believed to be systematically insincere, and whom he likewise suspected of intriguing with the King against his colleagues. This suspicion

* 'The King (says Horace Walpole) showed his aversion to Lord Rockingham so indecently and unfeelingly, that, though he had accepted him for his Minister, he did not once send to inquire how the Marquis did when he was dying.' (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. i. p. 440.)

† Mr. Fox was the nephew of the Duke of Richmond. His mother was the Duke's sister. The present Duke of Richmond is the great nephew of the Duke in question.

partly rested upon Lord Shelburne's general character, who had, so early as the year 1767, obtained from the writer of Junius the nickname of 'Malagrida,' on account of his supposed Jesuitical habits of mind.* Its chief ground, however, was Lord Shelburne's recent conduct in the negotiation for peace with America, the details of which we will proceed to narrate.†

The Secretary of State's office was formerly divided into the Northern and Southern Departments. The Southern Secretary had the management of home affairs, and of the correspondence with Ireland, the Colonies, and the States of Western Europe. The Northern Secretary conducted only the correspondence with the other European countries. This unequal and inconvenient division was discontinued upon the accession of the Rockingham Ministry, when the third or American Secretary was abolished, and the existing division of the Home and Foreign Departments was introduced.‡ The Home Office was formed out of the old Southern Department, and it therefore retained the Irish and Colonial business: the Foreign Office was formed out of the Northern Department, by the addition of

---

* It was given him in some anonymous productions by the author of Junius, which appeared under another signature. (See 'Woodfall's Junius,' vol. ii. pp. 472. 482.) Gabriel Malagrida, an Italian by birth, and a Jesuit, resided in Portugal. He was accused of participation in a conspiracy against the King, and was burnt by the Inquisition for heresy in 1761. He seems to have been scarcely sane. (Biogr. Un. and Chalmers, in v., and see Lord Mahon, vol. iv. p. 263.)

† Fox's resignation, says Lord Holland, was not the result of advice or persuasion. 'It was his own resolution adopted after much 'reflection, and founded on a general conviction that he could not con-'duct the public affairs under Lord Shelburne's treasury with safety, 'honour, or advantage; and from resentment at the duplicity with 'which his negotiations at Paris had been impeded by Lord Shelburne 'through Mr. Oswald, of which he thought Mr. Grenville's letters fur-'nished him indubitable evidence.' (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. i. p. 473. See some similar remarks of Lord Holland, ib. p. 387.)

‡ We have mentioned in a former Number that Lord Holland and Mr. Allen are mistaken in supposing that the division of the Northern and Southern departments subsisted at this time. (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. i. pp. 345. 475.) If Lord Shelburne had had the old Southern department *both* negotiations would have been in his hands; for both France and the Colonies were in that department. Lord Shelburne's letter to Mr. Grenville, of July 5. 1782, begins thus:—'His Majesty 'having thought proper to entrust me with the seals of the Foreign 'Department, *upon the resignation of Mr. Secretary Fox*, I take the 'earliest opportunity of notifying it to you.' (S. P. O.) The seals of this department were immediately afterwards transferred to Lord Grantham.

the correspondence with those foreign countries which had previously been under the charge of the Southern Secretary. The Home Secretary, as the successor of the Southern Secretary, retained the seniority in official rank.

In the beginning of the year 1782, Franklin, who had been appointed one of the American Commissioners for negotiating with France, was staying at Paris. At the time when Lord North's Ministry was about to expire, Lord Cholmondeley passed through Paris on his road to England, and called upon Franklin, though previously unacquainted with him. During his visit, he offered to carry a letter from him to Lord Shelburne; and Franklin accordingly wrote to Lord Shelburne a letter of civility, in which he referred to their former acquaintance, and took occasion to express a hope that the recent votes of the House of Commons might lead to a general peace. This letter was written in ignorance of Lord North's resignation, the news of which reached Paris immediately afterwards. When Lord Shelburne received this letter, he already held the seals of the Home Department; and as the American colonies were still considered as subject to the Crown of England, all affairs relating to them were under his official cognisance. Without delay, he took advantage of this accident to send Mr. Oswald, a London merchant, formerly resident in America, to Paris, in order to communicate with Franklin. Oswald accordingly arrived in Paris near the beginning of April, and had an interview with Franklin, at which he delivered to him private letters from Lord Shelburne, and Mr. Laurens, an American officer, then a prisoner in England.* Franklin, in his detailed journal of these transactions, states that Oswald, at this interview, described England as ready to concede the independence of America, and to treat of peace, but as prepared to continue the war if the terms insisted on by France were too humiliating. The answer made by Franklin was, that he could only treat in concert with France; but he offered to introduce Oswald to M. de Vergennes, the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, and an interview accordingly took place between them, a few days afterwards, in Franklin's presence. Oswald was unable to speak French, and the conversation was carried on through an interpreter. The general effect of this interview is related in a letter addressed by Franklin to Lord Shelburne. The principal points were, that France could not treat without her allies, and that Paris was suggested as the proper place for the

* See Franklin's Works by Sparks, vol. ix. p. 240., where the letters are printed.

negotiations. Oswald returned to London to carry the account of his interviews; bearing likewise the expression of Franklin's wish, that there might be no other channel of communication between him and the English Government than Oswald himself. Franklin, as Mr. Allen remarks, had doubtless soon discovered that Oswald 'was a simple-minded, well-meaning man, on 'whom he could make the impression he chose.' Upon Mr. Oswald's return to London, a meeting of the Cabinet was held, at which the following minute was agreed to:—

'April 23. 1782. Present, Lord Chancellor, Lord President, Duke of Richmond, Marquis of Rockingham, Duke of Grafton, Lord Ashburton, Lord J. Cavendish, Lord Keppel, Gen. Conway, Mr. Fox, Lord Shelburne.

'"It is humbly submitted to His Majesty that Mr. Oswald shall "return to Paris with authority to name Paris as the place, and to "settle with Dr. Franklin the most convenient time for setting on "foot a negotiation for a general peace, and to represent to him that "the principal points in contemplation are, the allowance of in-"dependence to America upon Great Britain's being restored to the "situation she was placed in by the treaty of 1763, and that Mr. Fox "shall submit to the consideration of the King a proper person to "make a similar communication to Mons. de Vergennes."' (Vol. i. p. 345.)*

Before Oswald left Paris, Franklin placed in his hands a paper, containing suggestions respecting Canada, for Lord Shelburne's consideration. It threw out the idea that Canada might be voluntarily ceded to the United States, as an indemnity for the losses occasioned by the war; and it concluded with these words:—'This is mere conversation matter between Mr. Oswald 'and Mr. Franklin, as the former is not empowered to make 'propositions, and the latter cannot make any without the con-'currence of his colleagues.' Franklin afterwards regretted that he had allowed the paper to go out of his own hands. On his

* We observe that the peculiar mode in which the ministers address the sovereign in private communications, which is now in use, was observed by Mr. Fox at this time. '*Mr. Fox* has the 'honour of transmitting *to your Majesty* the minute of the Cabinet 'Council assembled this morning at Lord Rockingham's.' 18 May 1782. (Ib. p. 351.) When this epistolary form was introduced, or by whom, we know not. The letters of Mr. G. Grenville to the King in 1765, printed in the Grenville Papers, vol. iii. p. 4—15., are in the ordinary form. 'I have but just now received the honour of 'your Majesty's commands on my return home from my Lord Chan-'cellor's, where I have passed the greatest part of the evening.' According to the more recent etiquette, the minister uses the third person, and addresses the Sovereign in the second.

return to Paris, Oswald told Franklin that he had shown the paper to Lord Shelburne, and by his desire left it with him for one night; that he had conversed with Lord Shelburne about it, and it seemed to have made an impression: the paper was then restored to Franklin.*

Oswald returned to Paris early in May, with instructions from Lord Shelburne to arrange with Franklin the preliminaries of time and place for negotiating, and also the announcement that a proper person would be shortly sent by Mr. Fox, 'from 'whose department that communication is necessarily to proceed,' to treat with M. de Vergennes.† This person was Mr. Grenville, whose speedy arrival, by way of Ostend, was announced by Oswald both to Franklin and the French Minister. Mr. Grenville shortly afterwards arrived at Paris, and was introduced by Franklin to M. de Vergennes, with whom he had a long conference on the subject of his mission.‡ Oswald now returned to

---

* It is remarkable that Mr. Forth, who had been sent secretly by Lord North to Paris before the change of Government, appears to have offered the cession of Canada as the price of a peace with France. (Franklin's Works, vol. ix. p. 210.) An account of Forth's mission is given in a despatch of M. de Vergennes, in Flassan, 'His-'toire de la Diplomatie Française,' vol. vii. p. 322., ed. 1811, but nothing is there said about an offer to restore Canada to France.

† Lord Shelburne to Franklin, 20th April, 1782. Franklin's Works, vol. ix. p. 265.

‡ 'The Count de Vergennes (says Franklin) received Mr. Gren-'ville in the most cordial manner, on account of the acquaintance and 'friendship that had formerly subsisted between *his uncle* and the 'Count de Vergennes, when they were ambassadors together at Con-'stantinople.' (Ib. p. 273.) The person referred to is Mr. Henry Grenville, brother of Lord Temple, who was ambassador at Constantinople from 1761 to 1765. M. de Vergennes was minister plenipotentiary at the same capital from 1755 to 1768. M. de Vergennes, in a despatch written at the time to the French ambassador in Spain, thus describes Mr. Grenville: — 'M. Grenville est très propre à 'recommander la mission dont il est chargé; c'est un jeune homme de 'trente ans au plus, qui annonce beaucoup d'esprit et de sagesse, 'd'honnêteté et de modestie. Il appartient à une famille considéra-'ble, qui est liée d'intérêt avec le ministère actuel, et il n'est guère 'vraisemblable que celui-ci lui eût destiné un rôle aussi plat et aussi 'peu analogue à sa naissance et à son état, que celui de venir nous 'ennuyer et nous tromper.' (*Flassan,* ib. p. 339.) Franklin, on making Mr. Grenville's acquaintance, says, 'he appeared to me a 'sensible, judicious, intelligent, good-natured, and well-instructed 'young man, answering well the character Mr. Fox had given me 'of him.' (*Works,* ib. p. 272.) These early notices of Mr. Grenville will be read with interest by those who enjoyed the pleasure of his

London, and soon after his arrival, the Cabinet advised the King to direct full powers to be given to Mr. Grenville to make propositions of peace to the belligerent Powers upon the basis of American independence, and his formal commission was accordingly despatched without delay.

Mr. Oswald returned to Paris early in June, bringing with him a paper of memoranda by Lord Shelburne, which he communicated to Franklin. This paper announced that 'on our '(*i. e.* the English) part, commmissioners will be named, or any 'character given to Mr. Oswald, which Dr. Franklin and he may 'judge conducive to a final settlement of things between Great 'Britain and America; which Dr. Franklin very properly says, 'requires to be treated in a very different manner from the peace 'between Great Britain and France, who have always been at 'enmity with each other.'* As soon as Franklin received this communication, and foresaw the prospect of negotiating with Oswald, whom he describes as having 'an air of great simplicity 'and honesty,'† he became reserved with Mr. Grenville, and showed a reluctance to speak openly to him. Mr. Grenville, combining this circumstance with the incident of the Canada

---

society in the later years of his long life, as well as by all who appreciate the value of the rare and well-selected library which he bequeathed to the public. Mr. Grenville was born in 1755, and therefore was, at this time, twenty-seven years old.

As the epistolary form in which sovereigns address one another, has lately been made a question of international importance, we subjoin a copy from the State Paper Office of the credential letter sent by George III. to Louis XVI., on the occasion of Mr. Grenville's mission: —

'Monsieur mon frère,

'Ayant fait choix du Sieur Grenville pour se rendre à votre cour en qualité de mon ministre, je vous prie de donner une entière créance à tout ce qu'il vous dira de ma part, et surtout aux assurances qu'il vous donnera de mon estime singulier pour vous, et de mon desir sincère de voir heureusement rétablie entre nous une amitié ferme et durable.

Je suis,
Monsieur mon frère,
Votre bon frère,
GEORGE R.

à St. James,
ce 21 Mai, 1782.

* Franklin's Works, vol. ix. p. 314.

† We regret to find that our countrymen, seventy years ago, did not find favour in Mr. Grenville's eyes: 'He spoke of Mr. Oswald '(says Franklin) as an odd kind of man, *but that indeed his nation* '*were generally odd people.*' (Ib. p. 334.) We may hope that Mr. Grenville lived to change his opinion.

paper, of which he had been informed by Oswald, came to the conclusion that he was crossed by a concurrent negotiator, and that the treaty could never be satisfactorily arranged with such a division of powers. He likewise appears to have thought that there was a deliberate intention of encroaching upon Mr. Fox's province, which he, as Mr. Fox's envoy, resented. Under the influence of these feelings, he wrote to Mr. Fox the important confidential letter of the 4th of June, of which the public were first made aware by the two publications prefixed to our Article. In this letter Mr. Grenville points to the promise of Lord Shelburne to appoint Oswald a commissioner, and to the Canada paper, as evidence that a separate and independent negotiation was proceeding which destroyed his utility. He therefore requests that he may be recalled, and that Lord Fitzwilliam, or some peer of sufficient importance to render it impossible to associate Oswald with him, should be appointed in his place. This letter led to an answer from Fox, asking for 'further proofs of 'this duplicity of conduct,' and speaking of 'the clandestine 'manner of carrying on a separate negotiation which we complain 'of;' but particularly inquiring how far Fox and his friends are at liberty to make use of the contents of Mr. Grenville's letter in order to call Lord Shelburne to account. Mr. Grenville replied to Mr. Fox in a letter which seems to have left Paris on the 21st; but before any steps could be taken upon it, Lord Rockingham's fatal illness and death brought the Government to an end. As soon as the news of this event reached Paris, Mr. Grenville resigned his mission, and returned to England.*

The editor of the Buckingham Papers (who seems to have been wholly ignorant of Franklin's detailed account) thus characterises this transaction: —

'It is clear, from the singular facts revealed in this correspondence, that while an *ostensible* minister was despatched to Paris by the general action of the Government, with the sanction of the King, to negotiate terms with the *American* minister, Lord Shelburne had

* The entire private correspondence between Mr. Grenville and Mr. Fox, during this mission, has now been published in the two works named at the head of our Article. The official correspondence is preserved in the State Paper Office, but has never been printed; a brief outline of it is given by Mr. Adolphus in his 'History of Eng-'land during the Reign of George III.,' vol. iii. c. 44. This correspondence (which we have perused) is conducted with great ability on both sides, and we regret that it still remains in manuscript. We may also remark that the discussion of the questions examined in the text would be more satisfactory if the entire documentary history of the Treaty of 1783 were before the public.

taken upon himself to appoint another negotiator, who was not only not to act in concert with Mr. Grenville, but *whose clandestine mission seems to have been expressly intended to thwart and embarrass him, and whose appointment was without the approval, or even the knowledge, of the Cabinet.*' (Vol. i. p. 26.)

Horace Walpole's account is not very different: —

'While Fox thus unfolded his character so advantageously, Shelburne was busied in devoting himself to the King, and in traversing Lord Rockingham and Fox in every point. If they opened a negotiation, he commenced another underhand at the same court. Mr. Fox despatched Thomas Grenville to Paris. Lord Shelburne sent *one, two, or three* privately to the same place, and addressed them to different ministers or persons of supposed credit.' (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. i. p. 321.)

Now, it is quite clear from our narrative of the facts, and from the testimonies which we have cited, that Oswald's first visit to Paris arose out of a letter accidentally addressed by Franklin to Lord Shelburne, before the change of Ministry was known to him; that Oswald returned to Paris with the full knowledge and approbation of the Cabinet, and as bearer of a message that he would be speedily followed by Mr. Grenville, as minister plenipotentiary to treat with the French Court; that he communicated with Mr. Fox when he was in London, and that Mr. Grenville knew he was at Paris, and communicated with him almost daily when he was there. * Mr. Oswald's mission had nothing *clandestine*, in the ordinary sense of the term. It was open and avowed on both sides of the water. It was known to Fox and the Cabinet; and it was recognised in the communications of Mr. Grenville with Franklin and M. de Vergennes. Neither can it be said, with Horace Walpole, that Oswald was sent to thwart Mr. Grenville; for Oswald's mission preceded Mr. Grenville's. Mr. Fox gives this account of the origin of Mr. Grenville's mission, in a letter to Mr. Fitzpatrick of the 28th of April: —

'Shelburne has had an answer from Dr. Franklin, who seems much disposed to peace, if general. M. de Vergennes has, it seems, expressed the same sentiments, and wishes to have some opening from hence; in consequence of this, Shelburne's man is to go back this day

* Mr. Fox's letter of instructions to Mr. Grenville (April 30. 1782) begins thus: 'When you arrive at Paris, you will endeavour to 'see Mr. Oswald as soon as possible, who will probably have an-'nounced your arrival.' In a subsequent letter to Mr. Grenville of May 21. Fox speaks of having received his letter by Mr. Oswald, and of having heard from Mr. Oswald an account of the state of affairs at Paris. (*State Paper Office.*)

to Paris, and upon the pretence of the business having begun with the American ministers, he had a great mind, if I would have consented, to have kept even this negotiation in his own hands; but this I would not submit to, and so Grenville is to set out for Paris tomorrow or next day, in order to state our ideas of peace to M. de Vergennes.' (Vol. i. p. 346.) *

These remarks imply that Fox was fully aware of the negotiation with Franklin having been begun by Oswald. Mr. Grenville was then sent by him to treat with the French Government, and he had a regular commission and credentials from the Crown for this purpose; but Oswald had no legal authority to treat, and had merely directions from the Secretary of State.

Let us now consider how far the two points raised by Mr. Grenville deserved to be considered in the serious light in which he and Mr. Fox regarded them. The most important of the two was the announcement, brought back by Oswald on his second visit to Paris, that Lord Shelburne was prepared to appoint him commissioner to treat with the American agents, his intention to make this appointment not having been previously communicated to Fox and his other colleagues. It is impossible not to see that if a proper cordiality had subsisted between Lord Shelburne and the rest of the Cabinet, he would have mentioned this intention to Lord Rockingham or Mr. Fox, before he announced it to Oswald. Nevertheless, his omission to take this step does not seem to us to have rendered it necessary to disturb the course of the negotiation by the strong measure to which Mr. Grenville resorted. If Mr. Grenville found by experience that a separate negotiator for America was likely to interfere with the rest of the negotiation, he could have represented this conclusion to his own Government, and the Cabinet would have then decided the question with the advantage of his opinion. Oswald had not as yet been appointed; and the appointment might still be arrested, notwithstanding Lord Shelburne's announcement, if the Cabinet thought fit to commit the entire negotiation to one person.† It is, however, to be observed that when the bill then

* See in Flassan, ib. pp. 328-59., the despatches of M. de Vergennes describing his interviews with Mr. Oswald and Mr. Grenville. It appears that he understood perfectly the state of the case, for he says of Oswald: 'Envoyé par Lord Shelburne, il n'avait point de commission pour moi, parceque ce secretaire d'état n'ayant dans son departement que l'Amérique et l'Irlande, c'est M. Fox qui est chargé uniquement des affaires de l'Europe.' (P. 333.)

† A similar misunderstanding arose between the two Secretaries of State about a negotiation at Paris in 1723. George I. was desirous of obtaining a dukedom for a French gentleman, who was to marry a

pending in Parliament, for enabling the King to conclude a peace with the American colonies, had passed, Oswald eventually received, under Lord Shelburne's Administration, a formal commission to negotiate with the American commissioners. * Mr. Fitzherbert (afterwards Lord St. Helen's) was appointed to succeed Mr. Grenville, with full powers to treat with France, Spain, and Holland. It appears from the correspondence in the State Paper Office that Oswald corresponded with Mr. Townshend, the Home Secretary, and Mr. Fitzherbert with Lord Grantham, the Foreign Secretary: so that the division of the negotiation between the two secretaries and their envoys continued to the signature of the preliminaries, and, so far as we know, did not produce the inconvenient results which Mr. Grenville anticipated, and about which he so much alarmed Mr. Fox. It may be added that M. de Rayneval, a confidential subordinate of M. de Vergennes, and also M. de Heredia, a person connected with the Spanish embassy, came over to London, and negotiated with Lord Shelburne; and that Mr. Strachey, the Under Secretary in the Home Department, was sent to Paris to assist Mr. Oswald; so that even other negotiators were added before the preliminaries of the treaty could be settled. † When the change

daughter of his mistress, Madame de Platen. Lord Carteret accordingly instructed Sir Luke Schaub, the English ambassador at Paris, to make interest for this purpose. 'This affair (says Lord Mahon) 'belonged to Carteret, as secretary for the Southern department, in 'which France was comprised, and the other secretary had no claim 'to interlope in his province. Nevertheless, Lord Townshend, un-'willing to see an affair of so much interest in the hand of a rival, 'determined, if possible, to draw it from his management. With this 'view, and at the instigation of Walpole, he despatched his brother 'Horace to Paris, under the pretence of settling the accession of Por-'tugal to the Quadruple Alliance, but in reality to watch the move-'ments and counteract the influence of Schaub.' (Vol. ii. p. 57.) This intrigue led to an open breach between the two secretaries, and to the dismissal of Lord Carteret.

* The intention to appoint Oswald as commissioner to negotiate with the Americans, had, however, been communicated to him by Lord Shelburne, in a letter dated June 30., the very day before Lord Rockingham's death. In this letter he states, that as soon as the Act had passed he lost no time in taking the King's commands for directing a commission to be made out conformable to the powers given to his Majesty. (MS. State Paper Office. A portion of the letter is printed in Franklin's Works, ib. p. 345.) He does not, however, say that he took the King's pleasure upon the appointment of Oswald.

† Concerning M. de Rayneval's secret mission, see Flassan, ib. p. 344.; Franklin, ib. p. 420. He is mentioned in the Mem. of Fox, vol. ii. p. 9., under the name of 'M. de Rennervalle.' A correspond-

of Government took place, the Duke of Manchester was sent by Mr. Fox in the place of Mr. Fitzherbert, and Mr. David Hartley in the place of Oswald; and their names appear respectively at the foot of the definitive treaties with France, Spain, and the United States, signed in September 1783. Both, however, as appears from the letters in the State Paper Office, corresponded with Mr. Fox. Lord North seems to have waived his right of instructing Mr. Hartley. No result, however, was obtained by Mr. Hartley's negotiation. The definitive treaty with the United States was identical with the preliminaries: so that Mr. Fox ended by adopting the precise results of Oswald's negotiation.

There was undoubtedly a great want of cordiality between Lord Shelburne and Fox, amounting to distrust and dislike; and a mutual jealousy of power, very undesirable in two Secretaries of State. Lord Shelburne may have acted, in his instructions to Oswald, without sufficient reference to the Foreign Secretary; but there is no evidence of any *intrigue* on Lord Shelburne's part, or of any attempt to negotiate through Oswald upon terms more acceptable to the King, or less favourable to America, than those prescribed by Fox to Mr. Grenville.* The King, as we have seen, only a month or two before, had been meditating a retirement to Hanover rather than consent to the independence of America. Yet this prin-

---

ence between M. de Rayneval and Lord Shelburne is preserved among Lord Shelburne's papers. M. de Rayneval first came to England in September 1782, under the assumed name of Castel; he returned shortly afterwards, and made a second visit in December. A short notice of him will be found in the 'Biogr. Universelle,' Art. *Gérard de Rayneval.* Mr. Strachey was sent over by Mr. Townshend to assist Oswald, on Oct. 23. 1782. (*Letter in State Paper Office; Franklin,* ib. p. 422.)

* 'There was (says Lord Holland) great mistrust and jealousy on 'both sides, much mystery and concealment on that of Lord Shelburne, 'which Mr. Fox and Mr. Grenville attributed, *perhaps too hastily,* to 'a secret understanding with the King. It is possible, and not im-'probable, that Grenville suspected more concealment, intrigue, and 'counteraction than really subsisted.' (*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 475. 477.) Franklin makes the following remarks in his journal: 'Lord Shel-'burne seems to wish to have the management of the treaty; Mr. 'Fox seems to think it in his department. I hear that the under-'standing between these Ministers is not quite perfect. . . . . I 'imagine we might go on very well with either of them, though I 'should rather prefer Oswald; but I apprehend difficulties if they are 'both employed, especially if there is any misunderstanding between 'their principals.' (*Works,* ib. p. 336.)

ciple was conceded from the moment of Mr. Grenville's mission; and Franklin was so well-pleased with Oswald, and so satisfied of his desire to settle the peace on terms favourable to America, that he expressed a strong wish that Oswald should be appointed to negotiate with him. Franklin's anxiety to secure Oswald's appointment is a decisive proof that 'Shelburne's man' was not desirous of promoting the views which the King had so fondly cherished; but, on the contrary, that he was desirous of promoting the views which the King had quite recently held in the utmost abhorrence.* So far was Lord Shelburne from yielding, like Lord North, to the King's prejudices on this subject, that his friends took credit to him for having persuaded the King to acquiesce in American independence.†

That Lord Shelburne did not use Oswald as the instrument of any royal intrigue, or for the purpose of inculcating any peculiar views of his own, is evident from Franklin's complaints of the scantiness of Oswald's communications. In writing to Mr. Laurens, on the 20th of April 1782, he says that Oswald had brought him a letter from Lord Shelburne assuring him that Oswald 'was fully apprised of his (Lord Shelburne's) mind.' 'Mr. Oswald, however (adds Franklin), could give me no other 'particulars of his Lordship's mind, but that he was sincerely 'disposed to peace.'‡ On his second visit to Paris Franklin says: 'On the whole, I was able to draw so little from Mr. 'Oswald of the sentiments of Lord Shelburne, who had men-'tioned him as entrusted with the communication of them, that 'I could not but wonder at his being sent again to me, espe-'cially as Mr. Grenville was so soon to follow.'§ In writing to Mr. Adams, on the 8th of May, Franklin says that Lord Shelburne informs him that Mr. Oswald is instructed to communicate to him his Lordship's thoughts. 'He is, however (Franklin 'adds), very sparing of such communication.'‖ On the tenth of May, Franklin 'found him in the same friendly dispositions, 'and very desirous of good, and seeing an end put to this ruinous

---

* A portrait of himself, which Franklin presented to Oswald, when the treaty was concluded, was given by his nephew, the late member for Glasgow, to Mr. Joseph Parkes, in whose possession it now remains in London.

† Gen. Conway made this statement in the House of Commons, in the ministerial explanations after Lord Rockingham's death, July 9. 1782. See also the expressions in Vaughan's letter, above.

‡ Works, ib. p. 254. § Ib. p. 269.

‖ Ib. p. 270.

'war. But (he says) I got no further sight as to the senti-'ments of Lord Shelburne respecting the terms.'*

Mr. Grenville is reported by Franklin to have expressed at Paris the opinion that 'Mr. Fox's resignation would be fatal to 'the negotiation.' Lord Shelburne, however, instructed him 'to repeat every assurance of the King's desire of peace, and 'not to leave any impression on the minds of those with whom 'he is in treaty of the least relaxation from the intention and 'spirit of the negotiation as hitherto carried on.'† Mr. Oswald seems to have lost no time in treating with Franklin; on the 10th of July he reports the first distinct proposal of terms made on the part of America; and the negotiation proceeded in an uninterrupted manner. It may be added, that the negotiation with America, and that with France and Spain, seem to have proceeded independently of each other, and the preliminaries were signed with America without the knowledge of the French Government.

With regard to the Canadian paper, the other point brought forward by Mr. Grenville, we confess that we cannot regard it otherwise than as a very trifling affair; and we are unable to understand how Lord Holland and Mr. Allen could have viewed it in so serious a light. When Oswald received the paper from Franklin, he was not invested with the formal character of a negotiator. He had no commission from the King; and Franklin gave it to him, not as a proposition during a negotiation, but as a suggestion, or matter for consideration. The paper was treated as confidential; and Franklin evidently did not intend that it should go further than Lord Shelburne himself. It required no answer, nor was any answer sent to it by Lord Shelburne; but the original paper was returned. There was, in our judgment, nothing, either in the contents of the paper or in the manner in which it came into his hands, which rendered it incumbent on Lord Shelburne to communicate it to his colleagues. It may be observed, too, that Oswald did communicate its purport to Mr. Grenville, with whom the conduct of the main negotiation rested; so that no possible inconvenience could have arisen from Lord Shelburne's silence on the subject.

Lord Holland speaks of Franklin having been 'encouraged 'by the prospect of some new concessions, and *especially of* '*Canada*, to hold aloof from the overtures made to him through 'Mr. Grenville;'‡ and Mr. Allen says that 'it is impossible

* Works, p. 276. Oswald disclaimed to Franklin all personal views, and all wish to remain at Paris. Ib. p. 316.

† Franklin, ib. pp. 366, 367.

‡ Mem. of Fox, vol. i. p. 469.

'to justify Lord Shelburne for his *favourable* reception of so 'important a paper as the one he had received from Franklin 'about Canada.'* There is nothing in Franklin's account to justify the inference that Lord Shelburne had expressed any opinion upon the paper brought by Oswald; he certainly sent no message to Franklin respecting it. We are, however, able, by the favour of the Marquis of Lansdowne, to lay before the reader a documentary proof that the 'favourable reception' of the paper in question must have proceeded from Oswald's imagination. In a volume of miscellaneous papers relating to the peace of 1783, collected by Lord Shelburne—now in Lord Lansdowne's possession—is a set of notes by Lord Shelburne for a conversation with Oswald, dated the 28th of April, 1782, and therefore written shortly before Oswald's second visit to Paris. Among these notes are some remarks on the Canada paper with reference to the passage in which Franklin says, 'I 'do not know that the Americans will insist on reparation; 'perhaps they may.'† We annex a copy of the notes in question, premising only that the Cabinet minute, mentioned at the beginning, appears from Franklin's Journal to have been communicated to him by Oswald, but without any copy being given. 'He showed me (says Franklin) the Minutes of Council, 'but did not leave the paper with me.'‡ As to the remark on the West Indies, it should be observed that Rodney's action took place on the 12th of April; so that it had already occurred when this memorandum was written, though the news had not reached England.

MEMORANDUMS TO MR. OSWALD IN CONVERSATION, 28TH APRIL 1782.

*Memorandums of General Instruction.*

'A copy of the Cabinet Minutes to be shown to Doctor Franklin, but he must have no copy of it.

'A fleet of upwards of forty ships in the West Indies—highly probable we shall intercept the reinforcement of the three ships for De Grasse.

'The French islands in great distress.

'A blow or two at sea may decide a great deal.

'Insist, in the strongest manner, that if America is independent she must be so of the whole world. No secret, tacit, or ostensible connection with France.

'If the negotiation breaks off, all our rights in America to stand as before.

---

* Mem. of Fox, vol. i. p. 384.

† Franklin's Works, vol. ix. p. 251. ‡ Ib. p. 266.

*Remarks on the Private Paper.*

'1st. Why does he say that he does not know of the Americans having any intention of making claims of indemnification, he and others having full powers.— That is not open. — No reparation to be thought of.—The money spent in America is more than sufficient indemnification for all particular losses. Lord Shelburne has a manuscript of Sir William Petty to send in return for this paper. The title of it is to show that Ireland would have been in a state of poverty and uncivilised savageness if it had not been for the money expended by the English in their wars in that country.

'All ideas of a supposed justice in claims of indemnification to be disowned; and if started, to be waived as much as possible.

'It is reasonable to expect a free trade, unencumbered with duties, to every part of America.

'Make early and strict conditions, not only to secure all debts whatever due to British subjects, but likewise to restore the loyalists to a full enjoyment of their rights and privileges. And their indemnification to be considered. Lord Shelburne will never give up the Loyalists. The Penn family have been sadly used, and Lord Shelburne is personally interested for them, and thinks it his duty to be so for all.

'The private paper desires Canada for three reasons:—

'1st. By way of reparation. — Answer. No reparation can be heard of.

'2nd. To prevent future wars. — Answer. It is to be hoped that some more friendly method will be found.

'3rd. Loyalists as a fund of indemnification to them.—Answer. No independence to be acknowledged without their being taken care of.

'A compensation expected for New York, Charlestown, and Savannah. Penobscott to be always kept.'

These observations on the Canada paper show that, if Lord Shelburne had sent any answer to it by Oswald, it would not have been a favourable one. The probability is, that he made no remark upon it to Oswald, fearing that he might offend Franklin; and that Oswald construed his silence into approbation. There is likewise another paper of similar notes, which ends with the following passage:—'Tell him (Franklin) candidly 'and confidentially, Lord Shelburne's situation with the King: 'that he was sent for to form the Ministry.

'That his lordship will make no use of it but to keep his 'word with mankind, and is under as little apprehension of being 'deceived himself, as unwilling to deceive others. In short, 'that he knows the bottom to be sound.'

The purpose of this projected communication was to satisfy Franklin that the King was not secretly hostile to the negotiation, and that the American negotiators need not fear that the treaty would be ultimately defeated by the King's interference.

It should be added that the cession of Canada was afterwards formally proposed by Franklin to Oswald, when the latter had been appointed Commissioner, and was reported to his own government, in a letter of July 12.; but that the proposition was not assented to.*

Lord Holland remarks that, 'this resignation of Mr. Fox is 'unquestionably one of the *two* passages of his public life most 'open to animadversion, and most requiring explanation.'† The wisdom of this decision resolves itself into a question of *general* mistrust of Lord Shelburne; for Lord Shelburne's accession to the Treasury would have placed another person at the Home Office, who would have had the control of the American negotiator. Mr. Fox thus describes his motives for resignation, in a

* The story of Franklin's coat (the truth of which has been denied by Sparks) is traced by Lord Mahon to the signing of the Treaty with France in 1778. (See his note, vol. v. p. 329.) Mr. Allen remarks that 'the anecdote rests on authority not slightly to be re-'jected. It was related to Lord Holland by Lord St. Helen's, one of 'the plenipotentiaries employed in negotiating the treaty, and the 'lasting impression it made on Lord St. Helen's leaves little doubt of 'the accuracy of his recollection. He could not speak without indig-'nation of the triumphant air with which Franklin told them he had 'laid by and preserved his coat for such an occasion.' (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. i. p. 385.) Lord St. Helen's, then Mr. Fitzherbert, was sent to Paris to negotiate with France, when Mr. Grenville resigned. He had no personal concern with the treaty between France and America in 1778; and therefore, if his testimony is not rejected, we must suppose that Franklin wore the coat *twice*. Mr. Fitzherbert signed the preliminaries with France and Spain, but Oswald signed those with America; the definitive treaty with America was signed by Mr. Hartley for England. Mr. Fitzherbert could not have been present, *officially*, when any signature with Franklin took place.

Mr. Fitzherbert, in a letter to Lord Grantham, of February 9. 1783 (preserved among the Shelburne papers), has the following passage:—'Dr. Franklin seems anxious to return to America, which 'I am sorry for, being persuaded that he will do his utmost, when 'there, to prevent all revival of goodwill and cordiality with the 'mother country; his rancour and inveteracy against which are as 'violent as ever. I could mention to your Lordship instances of this 'which would be almost ludicrous, if anything can deserve that name 'which is likely to produce such serious consequences.' The letter from Mr. Hartley to Mr. Fox, of 3rd September, 1783, S.P.O., reporting the signature of the Definitive Treaty with America, describes the existence of a very friendly feeling with the American Commissioners on that occasion.

† Vol. i. p. 472. The *other* passage alluded to by Lord Holland is the coalition with Lord North. (See vol. ii. p. 62.)

letter to Mr. Grenville of the 5th of July:—'I am sure my 'staying would have been a means of deceiving the public and 'betraying my party; and these are things not to be done for 'the sake of any supposed temporary good. I feel that my 'situation in the country, my power, my popularity, my conse- 'quence,—nay, my character, are all risked: but I have done 'right, and therefore in the end it must turn out to have been 'wise.'*

Lord Shelburne had held office in the Duke of Grafton's Administration, and had been a Secretary of State at the age of twenty-nine. He was a man of ability, and was eminent as a speaker; he belonged to the Whig party, but his more immediate political connexion was with Lord Chatham. During the American War, he continued in active opposition to the Government, and he had never been a favourite of the King. Before he left the Duke of Grafton's Cabinet in 1768, 'instigations to 'remove him (as we learn from the Duke's Memoirs) fell daily 'from the King.'† Ten years later, in March 1778, the King, writing to Lord North, thus expresses himself:—'I am willing, 'through your channel, to accept any description of persons that 'will come avowedly to the support of your Administration; 'and, as such, do not object to Lord Shelburne and Mr. Barré, '*whom personally, perhaps, I dislike as much as Alderman 'Wilkes.*'‡ In December 1779, Lord Shelburne made a speech

---

* Buckingham Papers, vol. i. p. 55.

† Cited by Lord Mahon, vol. v. p. 202., 3d ed. See his character of Lord Shelburne, Ib., p. 209.

Lord Shelburne seems to have been a strong free-trader, at a time when such opinions among statesmen were almost unknown. The following passage occurs in a letter from Benjamin Vaughan to Franklin, of February, 1783:—'The boldness of my friend's (Lord 'Shelburne's) conduct, has done infinite service to men's minds, as his 'conversation has done to the royal mind. You will take pleasure in 'hearing that he talked of making England a free port; for which, 'he said, we were fitted by nature, capital, love of enterprise, mari- 'time connexions, and position between the Old and New World, 'and the North and South of Europe; and that those who were best 'circumstanced for trade, could not but be gainers by having trade 'open.' (*Works*, ib. p. 489.) According to Lord Holland, Bentham always said, that 'Lord Shelburne was the only Minister he ever heard 'of who did not fear the people.' (*Memoirs of the Whig Party*, vol. i. p. 41.) M. Dumont, on coming to England in 1785, acquired the friendship of Lord Shelburne, and was entrusted with the education of his sons. (*Dumont, Souvenirs sur Mirabeau*, p. ii.)

‡ Lord Mahon, vol. vi., App. p. lvi. A story is told of Wilkes, after he had given up the trade of a patriot, having been present at a

in the House of Lords, in an American debate, which Mr. Fitzpatrick describes as 'excellent, very violent, *and very personal to the King.*'* It may be added that the King's aversion for Lord Chatham, with whom Lord Shelburne had acted, was latterly not less than his aversion for Fox. If, therefore, the King showed any preference for Lord Shelburne in 1782, it must have been, not because he liked him much, but because he disliked Fox more. Lord Shelburne, indeed, according to Lord Holland's testimony, 'always complained that the King had 'tricked and deserted him in 1782 and 1783;' and 'he always 'suspected the Court of secretly conniving at his downfall.'† On the other hand, the King complained of Lord Shelburne for resigning the Government too easily, and for not prolonging the fight against the Coalition. In an audience granted to Lord Temple, upon his return from Ireland, His Majesty 'recapitulated all the transactions of that period, with the strongest 'encomium upon Mr. Pitt, and *with much apparent acrimony 'hinted at Lord Shelburne,* whom he stated to have abandoned a 'position which was tenable, and particularly so after the popular 'resentment had been roused.'‡

Lord Holland, in his 'Memoirs of the Whig Party,' has given a full-length portrait of Lord Shelburne, founded on personal knowledge. His character is there summed up in the following words:—'His chief merits were courage, decision of 'character, and discernment in discovering the talents of in-'feriors. Want of judgment was his great defect. An im-'perious character, and suspicion, with its consequences, his 'ruling vices.'§ If habits of suspicion, and a persuasion of the

party with the Prince of Wales, and having joined in singing 'God 'save the King.' The Prince called to him, and asked how long he had sung that song. 'Ever since I have had the honour of knowing 'your Royal Highness,' was the answer.

* Memorials of Fox, vol. i. p. 239.

† Ibid. vol. i. p. 479.; vol. ii. p. 65.

'The late Earl of Shelburne told a friend of mine that the King 'possessed one art beyond any man he had ever known: for that, by 'the familiarity of his intercourse, he obtained your confidence, pro-'cured from you your opinion of different public characters, and then 'availed himself of this knowledge to sow dissension.'—(*Nicholl's Recollections and Reflections during the Reign of George III.*, vol. i. p. 389.) The same writer states, Ibid. p. 51., that the King ordered 'the members of his household to express their disapprobation of the 'peace, and thus affronted Lord Shelburne.'

‡ Buckingham Papers, vol. i. p. 303. The latter words allude to the incipient unpopularity of the Coalition.

§ Vol. i. p. 42.

general dishonesty of mankind, had prevented Lord Shelburne from being frank and open in his dealings, and had earned him the nickname of Malagrida, this fact was well known to Fox when he accepted office as his colleague. The arguments founded on this general presumption were not, as we have seen, greatly strengthened by the Oswald affair. It cannot be supposed that Fox was influenced by such appeals to his self-love, as that administered by Burke, when he spoke of 'the utter impossibility 'of his acting for any length of time *as a clerk* in Lord Shel- 'burne's Administration.'* If Fox had put forward his pretensions to the office of Prime Minister, he might consistently have resigned because they were rejected. But he proposed the appointment of the Duke of Portland to that office, and did not object to serve under *him*. The objection therefore, was, not to the subordination, but to the person of the chief.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, in a letter of July 5., thus pointedly describes the opinions of the public upon Fox's resignation: — 'All persons 'who have any understanding and no office, are of opinion that 'Charles has done right: all persons who have little understand- 'ing are frightened; and all persons who have offices, with some 'brilliant exceptions, think he has been hasty.' (Vol. i. p. 461.) Lord Temple, in a letter to Mr. Grenville, written on the previous day, gives the following account of a conversation which he had had with Fox at the House of Lords: —

'He stated his knowledge that Lord Shelburne would succeed to Lord Rockingham, and his idea of throwing up. I stated Lord Shelburne's promises to measures, which I found Lord Shelburne had made to him; but *the loss of the object*, which was evidently a favourite point with him, seemed to affect him much. I repeated my apprehensions that the people would not stand by him in his attempt to quit upon private grounds, which, from their nature would appear to be a quarrel for offices, and not a public measure. He saw all this, and said that it had been urged to him by several, but that he was not determined . . . . . My opinion, from all whom I have seen, is, that Fox has undone himself with the public; and his most intimate friends seem of the same opinion.' (*Buckingham Papers*, vol. i. p. 51.).

'The step (says Lord Holland) was universally lamented, and very naturally censured, by many friends of freedom and peace, who were unacquainted with the personal character of Mr. Fox and his colleagues, and who saw in it nothing but a fatal division in a body of men, to whom they were looking for a restoration of the blessings of peace, and the re-establishment of a virtuous system of government at home. To them it seemed the result of mere personal jealousy and

* Memorials of Fox, vol. i. p. 457.

squabbles for superiority, in which the interests of the public were overlooked.' (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. i. p. 472.) *

It appears that Mr. Fox had announced his intention of resigning, a few days before Lord Rockingham's death, in consequence of a decision of the Cabinet with respect to the recognition of American independence.† This fact was indeed publicly stated by him in the House of Commons, in answer to General Conway, who had intimated that his resignation had been determined by merely personal considerations.‡ It is indeed highly probable that, even if Lord Rockingham had lived, Fox would before long have seceded from the Cabinet. Mr. Fox, however, declared in the same debate that the appointment of Lord Shelburne to the office of First Lord of the Treasury, instead of the Duke of Portland, was one of the reasons of his resignation. Mr. Pitt, like General Conway, attributed Mr. Fox's conduct to private pique, not to public grounds, and contended that he ought to have remained in office, until he had seen Lord Shelburne abandon the principles upon which Lord Rockingham and his friends had acted.

In order to form a proper estimate of Mr. Fox's decision to refuse office with Lord Shelburne, it is necessary to consider his subsequent course, and to compare the political connexion which he abandoned with that which he proceeded to form. Before doing so, however, it is right to advert to the fact, that, when Mr. Pitt formed his administration in 1783, after the dismissal of the Coalition Ministry, he made no offer to Lord Shelburne, although he had, in the previous year, been Chancellor of the Exchequer, and leader of the House of Commons in his administration. This circumstance seems to indicate that he, like Mr. Fox, did not wish for Lord Shelburne as a colleague.§ Lord Shelburne resented this exclusion, and Lord

---

* Nicholls, ib. vol. ii. p. 140., gives it as his opinion that Mr. Fox's separation from Lord Shelburne took place on *private* grounds.

† Memorials of Fox, vol. i. p. 386. 435. 438-9. 453.

‡ July 9. 1782.

§ Lord Grenville, writing to Lord Temple, on December 7. 1782, says:—'I have said that the complexion of affairs here makes it more 'unpleasant. Lord Shelburne's evident intention is to make cyphers 'of his colleagues. Rayneval's arrival at his house at eight in the 'morning, was not known to Townshend till twelve, nor to any of 'the others till after four. They cannot be much pleased, but still it 'is imagined they mean to remain.' (*Buckingham Papers*, vol. i. p. 84.) This alludes to the arrival of M. de Rayneval, who was sent by the French Government to London, under a fictitious name, on the business of the peace. The length of time mentioned by Lord Gren-

Holland says that he even hesitated about accepting the marquisate, which was offered him by Mr. Pitt and the Court, as a mark of approbation of the peace.* Although Lord Shelburne accepted this mark of honour from Mr. Pitt's Government, he continued in opposition; taking, however, little part in politics, after his retirement from office.

We are now in full possession of the grounds upon which Mr. Fox acted on this occasion, derived from the most authentic sources, and we can pass judgment upon them without any of those personal feelings by which the minds of contemporaries are inflamed. If Mr. Fox, after a trial of three months, found that he could not act satisfactorily with Lord Shelburne, it must be admitted that he was justified in refusing to hold office in his Administration. But Lord Shelburne's Ministry was a Whig Ministry: it included even a portion of the Rockingham party; none of Lord North's party belonged to it; Mr. Pitt, the leader of the House of Commons, was a decided Whig, and had taken a strong part in overthrowing Lord North's Government. The leading principles of Lord Rockingham's Government, and particularly the recognition of American independence, were avowed by Lord Shelburne. If, therefore, Fox could not make up his mind to serve with Lord Shelburne, we think that, looking both to his duty as a public man, and to his policy as a leader of the larger section of the Whig party, his proper course was to stand aloof, to watch the conduct of the Government, to support it when right, to oppose it when wrong, to observe an armed neutrality, but not, as he actually did, to form a league, offensive and defensive, with the enemy. When Lord Rockingham died, and the King made Lord Shelburne, and not the Duke of Portland, Prime Minister, there were three courses open to Fox. 1. To remain in Lord Shelburne's Government. 2. To resign with his friends, and to form a separate independent party. 3. To coalesce with Lord North and the Tories. Of these three courses the last was, in our judgment, incomparably the worst; and this was the one which Fox selected.

---

ville does not seem very great. After Lord Shelburne's resignation, Lord Grenville, also writing to Lord Temple, says, speaking of the Coalition: — 'Yet these are the men who accuse Lord Shelburne of 'duplicity, *without having produced one instance during a six months*' '*ministry*.' (*Ibid.* p. 205.) Lord Grenville was probably by this time made aware of what had passed with his brother at Paris nearly twelve months before.

* Memoirs of the Whig Party, vol. i. p. 43. Some remarks upon this peerage will be found in this Journal, vol. xxv. p. 212., in a review of Wraxall's Historical Memoirs.

As soon as Lord Shelburne's Ministry was formed, a practical solution of the problem of the three bodies had to be found. Gibbon, writing near the commencement of the ensuing Session, mentions a calculation of the comparative strength of the three parties in the House of Commons, which gave 140 votes to the Government, 120 to Lord North, 90 to Fox, the rest unknown or uncertain.* In this state of things a combination of any two would defeat the third. The views of the Government were therefore naturally turned towards a junction with some portion of the Opposition. It was, however, laid down as a principle by Lord Shelburne and Mr. Pitt that they would not admit Lord North into the Cabinet: though they were willing to negotiate with some of his followers.† Hence they looked in the other direction, and on the 11th of February, 1783, Mr. Pitt sought an interview with Mr. Fox, in order to invite him to join Lord Shelburne's Government. The following is Bishop Tomline's account of what passed on this occasion: —

'Neither Mr. Pitt nor Lord Shelburne saw any reason why they should not act with Mr. Fox. It was therefore agreed that an offer should be made to him to return to office; for which purpose Mr. Pitt waited upon him by appointment. As soon as Mr. Fox heard the object of Mr. Pitt's visit, he asked, whether it was intended that Lord Shelburne should remain First Lord of the Treasury; to which Mr. Pitt answered in the affirmative. Mr. Fox immediately replied, that it was impossible for him to belong to any Administration of which Lord Shelburne was the head.‡ Mr. Pitt observed, that if that

* Gibbon to Lord Sheffield, Oct. 14. 1782. Miscellaneous Works, vol. ii. p. 261., 8vo.

† It is stated in the Memorials of Fox, vol. ii. p. 30., that the Duke of Richmond, Lord Keppel, and Mr. Pitt were inclined to a coalition with Fox, but that Lord Shelburne leant to Lord North. Horace Walpole speaks of overtures by Lord Shelburne to Lord North. (*Ib.* p. 12.) Lord Grenville, however, writing to Lord Temple, February 19. 1783, mentions, among some facts, the authenticity of which he vouches, that 'Lord Shelburne never has made any offer whatever 'to Lord North.' This fact was probably stated by him on Mr. Pitt's authority. (*Buckingham Papers*, vol. i. p. 158.) Tomline says, that 'Mr. Pitt positively objected to any application being made 'to Lord North.' (Vol. i. p. 88.) Mr. Dundas told Mr. Adam, that 'Pitt was ready to negotiate with Lord North's party, *on the basis* 'of excluding Lord North personally.' (*Memorials of Fox*, vol. ii. p. 21.) Lord Temple's private notes likewise mention a coalition with some of Lord North's supporters as practicable, but without Lord North himself. (*Buckingham Papers*, ib. p. 301.)

‡ Mr. Fox did not put forward his own claims to that office, but still insisted on the Duke of Portland. (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. ii. p. 12.)

In the debates which followed the dismissal of the Coalition

was his determination, it would be useless for him to enter into any farther discussion, "as he did not come to betray Lord Shelburne;" and he took his leave. This was, I believe, the last time Mr. Pitt was in a private room with Mr. Fox; and from this period may be dated that political hostility, which continued through the remainder of their lives.'*

There was nothing at this time, either in the public or personal relations of Mr. Fox and Mr. Pitt, which would have prevented them from acting together, and serving in the same Cabinet. Their political principles were similar; and Mr. Fox had spoken with high praise and admiration of Mr. Pitt's abilities and character upon his first appearance in public life. 'Fox,' says Walpole, 'had fondly espoused him, and kindly, 'not jealously nor fearfully, wished to have him his friend.'† It is probable that Fox would have now consented to this union, if his dislike of Lord Shelburne had not formed an obstacle.

The resolution of Lord Shelburne and Pitt not to negotiate

---

Ministry, Pitt publicly stated that he would not sit in the same Cabinet with Lord North; and after the dissolution (although he had then strong motives for standing well with the King) he spoke of the one virtue of the late Parliament, that 'it had put an end to Lord North's administration, and to the calamitous and ruinous war which he had brought upon the country.' (*Tomline*, vol. i. pp. 359. 478.)

* Life of Pitt, vol. i. p. 89. ed. 3. The date of this offer is fixed by Lord Grenville's letter of Feb. 11. 1783, where he says, 'Pitt told 'me to-day that it being thought necessary to make some attempt at 'a junction with Fox, he had seen him *to-day*, when he asked one 'question, viz., whether there were any terms on which he would 'come in. The answer was "None, while Lord Shelburne re-'"mained;" and so it ended. Upon this (Lord Grenville truly adds) 'I think one may observe that the one must be very desperate, the 'other very confident, before such a question could be so put and so 'answered.' (*Buckingham Papers*, vol. i. p. 148.) Tomline appears to refer this interview to 'the end of autumn,' which is clearly a mistake. We suspect, moreover, that the retort ascribed to Pitt, that 'he did not come to betray Lord Shelburne,' was never really uttered; though it doubtless correctly expresses Pitt's feeling at the time. See also Adam's account, 'Mem. of Fox,' vol. ii. p. 33., which agrees with Lord Grenville's, and does not support Tomline's. Walpole, *Ibid.*, p. 12., says that Fox had been sounded by the Duke of Richmond and Lord Keppel *before* Pitt's visit.

† Mem. of Fox, vol. ii. p. 5. See also Lord Holland's account, vol. i. p. 262. 'Till the unfortunate breach between the Whigs and 'Lord Shelburne, when Mr. Pitt sided with the latter, Mr. Fox 'never lost an opportunity of extolling the talents and praising the 'conduct of young Pitt.'

with Lord North, and the refusal of Fox to join Lord Shelburne's Government, produced an attempt of common friends to bring Fox and Lord North together. Fox wished to turn out Lord Shelburne. Lord North was resentful at being proscribed by him and Pitt; and the object was speedily effected. On the 14th of February, three days after the interview with Fox, he and Lord North met for the first time since their estrangement; and their interview is thus described: —

'They agreed to lay aside all former animosity, Mr. Fox declaring that he hoped their Administration would be *founded on mutual good will and confidence*, which was the only thing that could make it permanent and useful. They agreed, also, that nothing more was required to be done in reducing the influence of the Crown by economical reform, and that on parliamentary reform every man should follow his own opinion. Mr. Fox having urged that the King should not be suffered to be his own Minister, Lord North replied: "If you "mean there should not be a Government by departments, I agree "with you; I think it a very bad system. There should be one "man, or a Cabinet, to govern the whole, and direct every measure. "Government by departments was not brought in by me. I found "it so, and had not vigour and resolution to put an end to it. *The "King ought to be treated with all sort of respect and attention, but "the appearance of power is all that a king of this country can "have.* Though the Government in my time was a Government by "departments, the whole was done by the Ministers, except in a few "instances."' (Vol. ii. p. 37.)

Since the accession of Lord Shelburne's Ministry, the negotiations for a peace, on the basis of American Independence, had been steadily pursued. The preliminaries had first been signed with America, and subsequently with France and Spain. The settlement of this all-important question was announced in the King's Speech, and the Preliminaries were subsequently presented to Parliament. It was agreed that this question was a favourable field for a trial of strength between the coalesced parties of Fox and Lord North, and the Government. A motion of censure upon the Preliminaries of Peace was accordingly made by Lord J. Cavendish, and carried by 207 to 190 votes. Upon this defeat, Lord Shelburne and his Cabinet resigned (Feb. 24. 1783).

After a long *interministerium* (as Walpole calls it), and an attempt on the King's part to induce Mr. Pitt to attempt the formation of a Government—an undertaking which he steadfastly declined—a new Administration was formed, of which the Duke of Portland (as originally proposed by Fox) was the head, and in which Fox himself and Lord North were the

Secretaries of State. The other Cabinet offices were chiefly filled with followers of Fox.

Whatever admiration may be felt for the abilities, the eloquence, the patriotism, the courage, and the public spirit of Mr. Fox, no judicious and impartial biographer will, as it seems to us, seek to justify, or even to palliate, his coalition with Lord North. Lord J. Russell accordingly condemns, and does not defend it. In every point of view, it was an ill-assorted union. The political principles of the two chiefs were diametrically opposed to each other. Lord North had been, as Minister, the passive instrument of the Royal will; Fox had waged a vehement war against the King and his policy, and had, at last, achieved a victory over both. During the Parliamentary conflicts of the American war, there was scarcely a form of blame, or even of vituperation, within the compass of the English language, which Fox had not applied to Lord North: not only his conduct, his policy, and his principles, but his character, his honour, and his honesty, had been unsparingly denounced. Hints of impeachment had even been thrown out. These debates were quite recent in the beginning of 1783: the very words of Fox's terrible philippics against Lord North's profligate and ruinous administration must have been still ringing in the ears of the members who saw them take their seats, side by side, on the Treasury Bench, as the two Secretaries of State. All the disgraceful events of the latter years of the American war, and the censures which they had entailed on the Ministers who then mismanaged public affairs, were fresh in every one's thoughts; it was scarcely necessary to resort to such reminders as the 'Beauties of Fox, Burke, and North,' which were printed and circulated by the enemies of the 'monstrous and unnatural 'Coalition.' These were matters of universal notoriety, and the nation was shocked by a union of parties, in which they could see so little of public principle; so little to justify that 'mutual goodwill and *confidence*,' of which Fox spoke in his interview with Lord North. There was, therefore, no disposition to make in favour of the Coalition the allowance suggested by Lord Holland; namely, that Lord North had been insincere in his American policy, that he had carried on the war in order to please the King, and that the difference between his *real* opinions and the opinions of Fox was not considerable.*

* See 'Memorials of Fox,' vol. i. pp. 195. 254., vol. ii. p. 63. We think that Lord Holland's meaning is mistaken by Lord John in his note on the former passage. His object, as it seems to us, is to vindicate Mr. Fox, on the ground that Lord North *really* agreed with him in opinion.

For the public knew nothing of his secret opinions; they had not the privilege (which we now enjoy) of reading his private correspondence with the King; they judged him by his acts and his avowed opinions; and they knew that his course and that of Fox had, on all the leading questions of public policy, for the last eight years, but, above all, on the great question of the American war, been diametrically opposed. They thought that if Fox was right in his invectives against Lord North in the years 1774 to 1782, he could not be right in coalescing with Lord North in 1783. Besides, it might be felt that there is a medium between rancorous vindictiveness, and a spiritless oblivion of injuries. Though Lord North's well-tried good-nature would prevent him from cherishing resentful spite, there was something, in our judgment, inexpressibly mean in the tameness which the King's late favourite, covered with the scars of Fox's mighty sword, hastened to accept office in what was virtually *his* administration. Hence the public were more inclined to blame Lord North for joining Fox, than Fox for joining Lord North. Neither, however, escaped the unpopularity which attended their coalition: the public are, in general, sufficiently ready to believe that Ministers are influenced in their conduct by a mere love of place. On this occasion, it was natural for them to assume that Lord North and Fox were actuated by this motive, when they saw two such determined opponents coalesce in order to obtain office. It may be noted that if Fox's principles, as to the colleagues with whom he acted, were as latitudinarian as his coalition with Lord North evinces, it is difficult to understand why he should have refused to serve with Lord Shelburne, on the ground that he could not place entire confidence in him.*

While the nation disapproved of the Coalition on grounds of public policy, the King resented it still more acutely on grounds of personal feeling. He had for some time entertained the strongest aversion for Fox, his rival, his enemy, and now his conqueror and master; and that aversion had been recently strengthened by the friendship which had grown up between Fox and the Prince of Wales, now in his twenty-first year. The King had never loved his eldest son †; but his hatred for Fox

* Mr. Adolphus, 'History of George III.' vol. iii. p. 463., says of the Coalition, 'In no action of his life had Mr. Fox displayed less 'discernment.'

† Even so early as Nov. 28. 1781, Walpole has the following entry in his 'Diary':—'The King, as if he had never used the Duke of 'Gloucester ill, opened his mind to him on his son, the Prince of 'Wales, and his other brother, the Duke of Cumberland, the latter of

was aggravated by the belief that he had alienated the Prince's affections from him, and corrupted his principles. When the Coalition Ministry was formed, the Prince and Fox were on the most intimate terms. A series of notes from the Prince to him, of this date, beginning 'Dear Charles,' and written in a tone of confidential familiarity, are printed in these memoirs.* The King was said to have called the Coalition Ministry, 'his son's 'Ministry,' and his dislike of Fox, combined with his jealousy of the Prince, became, at this time, in Walpole's words, *a rankling ulcer.*† Nor were his feelings towards Lord North much more friendly. There were two Ministers to whom, in the course of his long reign, George III. gave a cordial, sincere, and consistent support. Those two Ministers were Lord Bute and Lord North. Even in the disastrous state of things which the country had reached at the beginning of 1782, the King was ready still to support Lord North, if the Minister could have held up his head against the hurricane of censure which night after night he had to encounter in Parliament. In taking leave

---

'whom, he said, was governed by Charles Fox and Fitzpatrick, and 'governed the Prince of Wales, whom they wanted to drive into 'Opposition. "When we hunt together," said the King, "neither '"my son nor my brother will speak to me; and lately, when the '"chase ended at a little village where there was but a single post-'"chaise to be hired, my son and brother got into it, drove to '"London, and left me to get home in a cart, if I could find one!" 'He complained, too, that the Prince, when invited to dine with him, 'came an hour too late, and "all the servants saw the father waiting '"an hour for the son."' (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. i. p. 269.) When Lord North's Government was falling, the Prince of Wales made interest against him, 'Though,' says Walpole, 'he only influenced one 'vote, that of Lord Melbourne, then recently made an Irish peer.' (*Ibid.* p. 286.) The Prince gave his vote in the House of Lords in favour of Fox's India Bill, at the very moment when the King had been canvassing the Peers against it. (*Tomline's Life of Pitt*, vol. i. pp. 220. 223. 226.) See also the account of Fox's intimate relations with the Prince, in 1785, at the time of the marriage with Mrs. Fitzherbert. (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. ii. p. 277.)

* Vol. ii. pp. 106—111.

† Ibid. pp. 45, 46. 57. Lord Grenville, in describing an interview with the King in March, 1783, says that 'he loaded Fox with every 'expression of abhorrence;' and he added, that much as he disliked both Fox and Lord North, if he was to choose he must certainly prefer the latter to the former. (*Buckingham Papers*, vol. i. pp. 190. 192.) Walpole, indeed, states, that 'when the Coalition Ministry kissed 'hands, the King received Fox graciously, but received Lord North 'with the utmost coldness, and continued to treat him with visible 'aversion.' (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. ii. p. 56.)

of Lord North on that occasion, the King had said, in the exuberance of his sorrow, that 'he ever had and ever should, look 'on Lord North *as a friend*, as well as a faithful servant.'* It must, therefore, have been with feelings of poignant disappointment, that he beheld the subject of so much royal favour, and even of royal affection, desert to the enemy, enlist in his service, and by his political influence assist in promoting the defeat and humiliation of his once partial but now deserted master.† If he meditated an escape to Hanover in the preceding year, when Lord North was expelled from office, it was still more natural that he should now again throw out threats of resorting to this extremity; of trying the effects of that royal secession to the Mons Sacer.‡ The iron of the Coalition had indeed entered into his soul, but there was another alternative

* Memorials of Fox, vol. i. p. 289.

† Lord Grenville, in the letter already quoted, says, that the King spoke of Lord North 'in terms of strong resentment and disgust.' (*Buckingham Papers*, vol. i. p. 191.) Lord Temple mentions the King's language, at a subsequent audience, respecting Pitt and Lord Shelburne, and adds, 'This was naturally attended with strong expres-'sions of resentment and disgust of his Ministers, and of personal 'abhorrence of Lord North, *whom he charged with treachery and* '*ingratitude of the blackest nature.* He repeated, that to such 'a Ministry he never would give his confidence, and that he would 'take the first moment for dismissing them.' (*Ibid.* p. 303.) In a letter to Lord Temple of April 1. 1783, the King speaks of 'the 'uneasiness of his mind at having been thwarted in every attempt to 'keep the administration of public affairs out of the hands of the 'most unprincipled Coalition the annals of this or any other nation 'can equal,' and he afterwards sneers at 'the *grateful* Lord North.' (*Ibid.* p. 219.) We owe likewise to the kindness of the Marquis of Lansdowne the information that amongst his father's papers there is a report of a conversation between the King and Lord Ashburton (Dunning) about this time, in which the King is described as complaining in strong terms of Lord North's desertion of him. Lord North's *ingratitude* was doubtless what rankled most in the King's mind, and, it must be admitted, not without reason. Lord Mahon ('History of England,' vol. v. p. 253.) remarks, that the King never forgot his obligations to Lord North. It would, perhaps, be more correct to say, that the King never forgot Lord North's obligations to him.

‡ Under March, 1783, Walpole says, 'His counsellors were as 'inveterate as his Majesty, but had less boldness; finding which, he 'told the Lord Advocate that sooner than yield he would go to 'Hanover, and had even prevailed on the Queen to consent.' (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. ii. p. 44.)

besides Hanover, and he resolved to take the earliest opportunity of shaking off his hated Ministers. We shall see that no long time elapsed before this opportunity presented itself.

The formation of the Coalition Ministry was announced on the 2nd of April, 1783.* Mr. Pitt was pressed by Fox's friends to join it, retaining his office of Chancellor of the Exchequer; but he refused on the ground that he would not serve with Lord North.† Nothing remarkable occurred during the remainder of the Session, and the prorogation took place in July. Parliament met again on the 11th of November, and the King's speech announced with satisfaction the signature of definitive treaties of peace with France, Spain, and the United States of America. Mr. Pitt, now the leader of Opposition, reminded the Ministers that these treaties were substantially identical with the preliminary articles upon which they had turned out the Shelburne Administration. The negotiation of that treaty was chiefly the work of Lord Shelburne himself, and its result was a conclusive proof that he had no wish to

---

* Watson, Bishop of Llandaff, in the 'Anecdotes of his Life,' vol. i. p. 173., says, that on the day the Coalition Ministry kissed hands, he 'told Lord J. Cavendish that they had two things against them—the 'closet and the country; that the King hated them, and would take 'the first opportunity of turning them out, and that the Coalition 'would make the country hate them.'

† This fact is stated by Tomline, Ibid. p. 155. 'Both Adam and 'Dundas expressed their wish that Pitt could be included in the new 'arrangement [the Coalition Ministry]. Dundas said he had done 'all in his power to bring it about, but he found it impossible. . . . . 'He afterwards said, Pitt is impracticable on the subject of union: he 'proscribes Lord North, and does not even express himself clearly 'disposed to unite with Fox. He has a high opinion of Fox's abilities, and had always wished to have him in the Government, because 'he thought it impossible to conduct great and difficult affairs with 'such abilities to criticise them. But now he seems much estranged 'from him.' (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. ii. p. 41.)

Mr. Fox thus expressed himself respecting Pitt, in a letter to Lord Ossory of 9th September, 1783, written under the Coalition Ministry during the recess:—'Next session of Parliament will be a great 'crisis. *I own I am sanguine about it.* Nothing can go on so well 'as we do among ourselves, but in my particular situation it is impossible not to feel every day what an amazing advantage it would 'be to the country if it could ever be in such a state as to promise a 'permanent administration in the opinion of Europe. If Pitt could 'be persuaded (but I despair of it), I am convinced if he could, he 'would do more real service to the country than any man ever did.' (Vol. ii. p. 208.) In speaking of 'my particular situation,' Fox alludes to his office of Foreign Secretary.

make reservations in treating with the United States, and that he was prepared for the fullest recognition of American independence. Some concessions were made to France, and particularly to Spain*; but the really important feature of the treaty was the unqualified recognition of the American colonies as independent States. The preliminaries were unpopular, and Mr. Fox had taken advantage of that unpopularity in order to overthrow a weak Ministry; but the concessions made were necessary, and were wisely adopted by Mr. Fox in the definitive treaties which were signed under his auspices. If any blame was due for the concessions, it should have fallen on those who by their mismanagement of public affairs reduced England to such a state of weakness as compelled her to yield, not on those who extricated her from a hopeless and ruinous war. When the vote of censure was passed, Lord North and the Ministers ought to have changed places.†

---

* The cession of Gibraltar to Spain was seriously in question at this time. A history of the negotiation respecting it is given in 'Flassan,' ib. pp. 345–353. Lord Grenville, in a letter of Dec. 15. 1782, mentions a rumour that Lord Shelburne was outvoted in the Cabinet upon the question of Gibraltar. (*Buckingham Papers*, vol. i. p. 89.) On two former occasions offers for the cession of Gibraltar had actually been made to Spain by the English Government,—once by General Stanhope in 1718, and again by the Elder Pitt in 1757. (See 'Lord Mahon's History,' vol. ii. p. 127., vol. iv. p. 111.) Speaking of the negotiations for the treaty of 1783, Flassan says, 'Les 'ministres Anglais du moins, et particulièrement lord Shelburne et 'lord Grantham, montrèrent de la droiture, et une envie de la paix 'qui n'était balancée que par la crainte que le parlement ne la trouvât 'pas assez avantageuse.' (*Ibid.* p. 365.)

† It is curious to observe how general the belief was, both in England and on the Continent, that the power and greatness of this country had been ruined by the loss of the American colonies. 'The 'era of England's glory,' said Mr. Pitt, in defending the preliminaries of peace, 'is past; she is now under the awful and mortifying neces- 'sity of employing a language corresponding with her new condition. '*The visions of her power and preeminence are passed away.*' Coxe, in describing the effects of the Treaty of 1783, says: 'The 'Bourbon Courts exulted in the success of their machinations, and 'confidently anticipated the speedy downfal of the British power.' (*Bourbon Kings of Spain*, c. 75.) Again he says: 'France exulted 'in having wrested the colonies from the mother country, and antici- 'pated the advantages which she expected to derive from the diminu- 'tion of the British commerce and power. The same opinion prevailed 'throughout the Continent, and *the Court of Vienna in particular* '*prophesied that England would ultimately sink in the unequal con-* '*test with the House of Bourbon.* Nor were there wanting even in

About a week after the beginning of the Session, Mr. Fox introduced his famous India Bill. Its principal feature was that it vested the government of India, for four years, in a commission of seven persons named in the Bill, and not appointed or removeable by the Crown. As soon as the plan was disclosed, Pitt denounced it as dangerous to the Constitution, and as a violation of the chartered rights of the East India Company; and the most ambitious designs were imputed to its authors. The subject was properly in the department of Lord North, as Home Secretary*, for the same reason that the colonies were in his department; but the measure was introduced and managed by Mr. Fox, who had probably been assisted by Burke's advice in its preparation. The Bill, owing to the numerical strength of the Coalition, soon passed the House of Commons, and it was carried up to the Lords by Mr. Fox at the head of a large body of members on the 9th of December. Here, a different fate awaited it. The King, assisted by the suggestions of artful counsellors, sagaciously perceived that his enemies had given him the opportunity for which he was waiting. The Coalition had rendered Fox unpopular; his India Bill had alarmed the country. A canvass of the Peers against the India Bill was set on foot by the King, partly or chiefly through the medium of Lord Temple. In the House of Lords, the 'King's 'friends' were numerous; and on the 17th of December the Bill was rejected by 95 to 76 votes. On the following day Fox and Lord North were required to deliver up their seals; and Pitt, seeing the change which had taken place since the spring, now consented to form a Government.

Pitt's Administration, though it lasted sixteen years, did not commence under happy auspices. However great his ability, his age was only twenty-five years; the majority of the House of Commons was against him, and the Coalition had absorbed so many of the leading members, that he had not in that House a single Cabinet minister to assist him. The late Government had been upset by the use of the King's personal influence in soliciting the votes of the Peers against his own Ministers. This royal interference was notorious, and almost avowed; Tomline, in his 'Life of Pitt,' admits and defends it. Pitt doubtless took no part in this intrigue, but he knew of it, and profited by its results to obtain power. Lord Temple, who had accepted the

---

'England persons of enlightened minds, who regarded this peace as 'the ruin of their country, and who predicted that "the sun of Great '"Britain was set for ever.' (*House of Austria,* c. 48.)

* Tomline's Life of Pitt, vol. i. p. 463.

seals of Secretary of State, and who had been intended for leader of the House of Lords, found the feeling respecting his own conduct so strong, that he resigned his office in three days, in order that he might meet any charges against himself in a private station. 'This,' says Tomline, 'was the only event 'of a public nature which I ever knew disturb Mr. Pitt's rest, 'while he continued in good health.'* At that moment Mr. Pitt no doubt felt uncertain whether the waters were not closing around him. So great did the chances appear against his success in his hazardous undertaking, that when his writ was moved, on his acceptance of office, the motion was received with loud and general laughter by the Opposition.† Fox was confident that the attempt would fail. In a private note written at the time he says, 'We are so strong, that nobody can under-'take without madness, and if they do I think we shall destroy 'them almost as soon as they are formed.'‡ This opinion he openly declared, and it was doubtless shared generally by his party.

The siege was now opened in form; a series of general votes of censure upon Ministers, and addresses to the Crown for the formation of a new Administration, were passed by the House of Commons. The King, however, refused to dismiss his Ministers, and Mr. Pitt refused to resign unless some specific charge was brought against him. The contest was carried on with consummate skill and ability by Fox on the one hand, and sustained with extraordinary coolness, courage, and judgment by Pitt on the other. Fox, however, abstained from going to extremities, being restrained, probably, by the reluctance of some of his friends; and while the struggle was still undecided, an attempt was made by some independent country gentlemen to

---

* Vol. i. p. 233. Mr. Fox, writing to Lord Northington, the Irish Chancellor, to inform him of Lord Temple's resignation, says, 'What 'will follow is not yet known, but I think there can be very little 'doubt but our Administration will again be established. . . . . The 'confusion of the enemy is beyond all description, and the triumph of 'our friends proportionable.' Dec. 22. 1783. (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. ii. p. 224.)

† Tomline, Ib. p. 237.

‡ Mem. of Fox, vol. ii. p. 221. Compare Tomline, Ib. p. 463. At this time it used to be the practice for Cabinet Ministers to appear in the House of Commons in full dress. Hence Lord North is always designated in the debates during the American war as 'the 'noble Lord in the Blue Ribbon.' We have been informed that, after Mr. Fox had crossed to the Opposition bench, he continued to wear his full dress, in order to mark that, though dismissed by the King, he was still the Minister whom the House kept in power.

bring about a junction between the two combatants.* The King was even prevailed upon to send a written message to the Duke of Portland, to propose a meeting between him and Mr. Pitt.† Mr. Pitt consented to have a conference with the Duke of Portland, 'for the purpose of forming a new Administration on a wide basis, and on fair and equal terms;' but a discussion arose on the meaning of '*equal* terms,' and the negotiation was broken off. The Opposition demanded that Pitt should resign before any attempt was made to form a united Government; but Pitt refused this demand, saying, that he could not resign in order to treat for office. The contest had now lasted for two months; the necessary supplies had been granted, and a Mutiny Bill passed; the majorities, which had been forty or fifty at the beginning, had dwindled down to one; and at last, without an Appropriation Act, on the 24th of March the King came down to dissolve the Parliament.‡ Pitt had wisely calculated the effect of time in turning public opinion in his favour. An earlier dissolution might have produced a balanced state of parties. As it was, the influence of general opinion upon the elections, even in the comparatively shackled state of the representation, was decisive. Above 160 members lost their seats, nearly all of whom belonged to the Opposition. The rout of the Coalition was complete, and after the long series of votes of censure carried against Pitt at the end of the preceding Parliament, the first vote in the new House gave him a majority of more than two to one. From that time Mr. Pitt's majority in the House of Commons remained unshaken.

Of this result, the principal cause was Fox's coalition with

---

* In one of the debates at this time, Mr. Fox said that he respected what he had always understood to be Mr. Pitt's political principles, none of which did any one whom he had consulted wish him to renounce. The union he (Mr. Fox) wished to see take place was a union of principle. (See Tomline, Ib. p. 356.)

† Mem. of Fox, vol. ii. p. 234.

‡ The Duke of Richmond, who had separated from Mr. Fox when Lord Shelburne became Prime Minister, was a member of Pitt's Cabinet, and contributed essentially to support him against Fox on this trying occasion. 'His firmness during the memorable contest of '1784 is said to have prevented Mr. Pitt from following the example 'of his cousin, Lord Temple, by resigning in despair. It was on 'that occasion George III. was reported to have said there was no 'man in his dominions by whom he had been so much offended, and 'no man to whom he was so much indebted, as the Duke of Rich-'mond.' (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. i. p. 455.) See also Tomline, vol. i. p. 235. His reasons for separating from Fox are stated in Lord Albemarle's Memoirs of Lord Rockingham (vol. i. p. 340.).

Lord North. Although it gave him, for the moment, a large parliamentary support, it turned public opinion against him, and rendered his union with Pitt impossible. If his party was not strong enough to stand alone, and *some* junction was necessary, he clearly made the wrong choice in preferring Lord North to Pitt. His India Bill added to his unpopularity, and had a large share in the consequences of the election of 1784. It is difficult now to understand how the declamatory denunciations of that measure could have produced so great an effect on the country, or how the alarm which was expressed could have been really felt. Pitt may have been under the influence of strong personal prejudice, but his general character forbids the belief that his opposition was insincere. He had doubtless persuaded himself of the reality of the dangers which he described with so much force. The interference with the chartered rights of the Company, so far as they concerned the Government, not the trade, of India, seems to us to require no justification. The Company could have no vested interest in a form of Government which was not conducive to the public welfare. The appointment of an Indian Commission by Parliament, the members of which held their offices on the same tenure as the Judges, and could not be removed either by the Crown or the Company, was unusual, and might be fairly deemed objectionable.* But to suppose that within the space of four years, and under the control of Parliament and public opinion, such a use was likely be made of the Indian patronage as would destroy the legitimate influence of the Crown, and insure the permanent triumph of Mr. Fox's party, appears extravagant and unreasonable.† In the first Session of the new Parliament Mr. Pitt introduced his India Bill, which was carried by a majority of 271 to 60; this Bill, by creating a Ministerial Board of Control for the affairs of India, established the system of 'double Government,' which has now existed for seventy years, and which was deli-

* A protest, formally signed by Lord Rockingham, the Duke of Portland, Lord Fitzwilliam, and other peers, which was much quoted at the time, contained the following passage: 'The election of executive 'officers in Parliament is plainly unconstitutional, and an example of 'the most pernicious kind, productive of intrigue and faction, and 'calculated for extending a corrupt influence in the Crown. It frees 'Ministers from responsibility, while it leaves them all the effect of 'patronage.' (See *Adolphus*, vol. iv. p. 59.)

† See Lord J. Russell's remarks on Fox's India Bill, vol. ii. pp. 96-100. A good summary of the objections made to it at the time is given in Tomline's Life of Pitt, vol. i. pp. 192-201.

berately continued, with certain amendments, in the last Session of Parliament.

While the great struggle between Pitt and Fox after the dismissal of the Coalition Ministry was going on, the King's anxiety was great; and in his private letters to Mr. Pitt he recurred to his former intention of seeking a refuge in Hanover from the intolerable pressure of his Parliamentary foes. On receiving the account of the first defeats which awaited Mr. Pitt upon his re-election, the King wrote to him as follows: — 'I am ready to take any step that may be proposed to oppose this 'faction, and to struggle to the last period of my life; but I can 'never submit to throw myself into its power. If they, in the 'end, succeed, *my line is a clear one, and to which I have forti-* 'tude enough to submit.'* About the same time he addressed Mr. Pitt in a similar strain upon an impending motion in the House of Lords: — 'Should not the Lords stand boldly forth, 'this Constitution must soon be changed; for if the two only 'privileges of the Crown be infringed, — that of negativing Bills 'which have passed both Houses of Parliament, and that of 'naming the Ministers to be employed, I cannot but feel, as far 'as regards my person, that *I can be no longer of utility to this* 'country, nor can with honour continue in this island.' 'From 'this extract,' says Tomline, 'coupled with the conclusion of 'his former letter, as well as from other authorities, it is evident 'that the King had at this time serious intentions of retiring to 'Hanover, in case Mr. Fox and his party should prevail.'†

No such painful necessity, however, awaited the King. The fatal error of his great adversary, the dexterity of his secret counsellors, and the consummate parliamentary ability of his young Minister, gave him a signal triumph. Fox had emerged a victor out of the long struggle of the American war: he had passed the King under the yoke, and made him submit to a Ministry which he hated. But he could not convert a victory into a conquest: he had the force which enabled him to defeat, he had not the longsighted and patient prudence which could alone enable him to subjugate. By the unhappy Coalition he

* Tomline's Life of Pitt, vol. i. p. 271. In a letter to Mr. Pitt, of Feb. 15. 1784, the King used the following terms respecting Mr. Fox: 'Mr. Pitt is so well apprised of the mortification I feel at any 'possibility of ever again seeing the heads of Opposition in public 'employments, *and more particularly Mr. Fox, whose conduct has* 'not been more marked against my station in the empire, than 'against my person, that he must attribute my want of perspicuity, '&c.' (*Ibid.* p. 396.)

† Ib. p. 341.

lost everything: he threw away his popularity, he destroyed his party, he weakened his moral authority, and he made an opening for the formation of a new combination, which speedily predominated in both Houses of Parliament. As it was said of Napoleon that he was the heir of the Revolution, so it may be said of Pitt that he was the heir of the Coalition. At the critical moment, he was able to satisfy the conditions of the practical problem, which had for so many years remained unsolved. Lord North had, during his twelve years' Ministry, been the favourite of the Crown, but after a time he lost the support of the country. Mr. Fox, up to the Coalition, was warmly supported by the country, but the King would not endure him. In Mr. Pitt was at last found a Minister whom the King would tolerate and the country would support. His Administration, when once formed, could not be shaken by Fox's opposition. It weathered the storm of the Regency, by the King's timely recovery; and the results of the French Revolution gave it additional strength. At last, it fell by an intrigue of secret advisers who alarmed the Protestant conscience of the King: it was stabbed by an assassin in the dark, not overthrown by the blows of Fox's broadsword in fair and open parliamentary warfare. Like most great political contests in this country, the contest between George III. and Mr. Fox ended in a compromise. The compromise was effected in the person of Mr. Pitt.* Mr. Pitt was too unbending to become an instrument in the King's hands, and had too much principle to lend himself, like Lord North, to a policy of which he disapproved. On the other hand, the King was grateful to Pitt for rescuing him from the hands of Fox: he endured and almost liked him, though he ultimately tripped him up. Pitt's ascendency in Parliament was maintained by his own talents and conduct, and by the personal confidence which he inspired, not by the influence of the Crown,

* 'On Lord Rockingham's death, Pitt expressed his concern to 'Mr. Fox under the gallery, at the report that Government would 'break up. Fox said, "it would, and the whole system be revived," 'adding, "they look to you; without you they cannot succeed; with '"you I know not whether they will or no." "If," replied Pitt, "they '"reckon upon me, they may find themselves mistaken." Fox, as he 'left the House, repeated this to Lord John Townshend, and Lord 'Maitland (afterwards Lauderdale), and probably many others; and 'both Townshend and Lauderdale told it me. Fox added, "I believe '"they do reckon on Pitt, and I believe they will not be mistaken."' (*Lord Holland, in Mem. of Fox,* vol. i. p. 446.) Neither of the parties in this curious dialogue were quite right in their anticipations.

or the support of the King's friends. In this manner the conflicting elements, which Fox could not harmonise, were reconciled.

Lord John thus sums up the effects of the Coalition, and the disruption of the Whig party, which that measure of apparent union produced: —

'Thus was broken and dispersed, by its own dissensions, that great confederacy of freedom which, nurtured in the adversity of the American war, had revived the ancient virtues of Whiggism, and made the Senate shine with the lights of patriotism and eloquence. Thus vanished the hope of seeing a more brilliant Fox and a more consistent Pitt; the one adorning and advising his country in the conduct of foreign affairs, which he, above all men, understood; and the other applying to the management of our finances the economical principles of Smith, and the wise frugality of Sully. The Coalition prevented a consummation so desirable. * * * The rout of the Whig party, the Pitt Administration, and the war of the French Revolution were the results of this fatal event.' (Vol. ii. p. 91.)

The life of Mr. Fox is brought down in these volumes to the year 1792; the Buckingham Papers reach as far as 1799; and both works contain much curious and authentic information respecting the Regency debates in 1788-9: but the length to which this Article has already extended prevents us from following the events of that period in detail; we can only remark that much light is thrown upon it by both publications.

The period of our history from the decline of the American war to the commencement of Mr. Pitt's long Administration, is full of instruction with respect to the working of our Parliamentary Constitution. It was not, in fact, definitively and clearly established until the year 1784, that where there is a conflict between the personal opinions of the sovereign and those of a majority of the House of Commons, the latter, and not the former, is to prevail; unless, indeed, a dissolution and a new election should reverse the decision of the previous Parliament.* The lessons which this portion of our annals teaches are manifold; but it throws especial light on the two points which appear to us to form the characteristic difficulties of that form of Government which is commonly known by the appellation of 'limited monarchy;' that is to say, a hereditary King, associated with a parliamentary body. These are, 1. The desire of the King to govern as well as to reign, and his attempts, open or concealed, to defeat the policy of the Ministers in whom the majority of the Parliament, for the time being, confides.

* On the constitutional right of the Crown to dissolve Parliament in this state of things, see the authoritative remark of Lord J. Russell (vol. ii. p. 245.).

2. The envies and rivalries of the parliamentary chiefs; their impatience of a superior, or even of an equal; their unwillingness to co-operate for public objects, on account of their separate pretensions and personal ambition; and the consequent facility afforded to the King of ruling by division, of fomenting their discords and animosities, and ultimately, perhaps, of reducing them all to impotence and silence.* Parliamentary leaders of parties, in their more contracted sphere, are likely to indulge the feelings which animated the great party leaders of Rome in their contest for the mastery of the world,—

> 'Nec quemquam jam ferre potest, Cæsarve *priorem*,
> Pompeiusve *parem*.'

But there is this important difference in their respective situations, that, whereas Pompey and Cæsar contended which should be chief, parliamentary leaders, who act singly, and embroil everything with mutual jealousies, end by being all put down under the feet of one common master.

We have no space now to dwell upon this theme at the length which it requires, but we wish that our feeble voice could induce the leaders of popular parties on the Continent to gather from our history the warnings which it contains with respect to the working of a parliamentary system. If the great Powers should continue at peace; if the quiet development of wealth and industry, and the amicable relations of individuals in society, should be permitted to advance without the interruption of destructive violence; we cannot believe that the fairest and most civilised portions of Continental Europe will remain under purely despotic forms of government. The trial of the American model, which has been made in some European States, has not proved successful; and though we are far from being exclusive in our attachment to constitutional forms, and

---

* Aristotle enumerates want of mutual confidence as one of the three great means by which the Greek despots maintained their power. (Pol. v. 11.) The impatience of equals is well denoted in the expressive Greek term, *τὸ φιλόπρωτον*.

Mr. Fox, in a letter of May 1782, expresses a fear that Pitt will attempt to revive the system of governing by the influence of the Crown, and in defiance of the independent portion of Parliament. He then proceeds to say:—'I feel myself, I own, rather inclined to 'rely upon his understanding and integrity for resisting all the temp-'tations of ambition, and especially *of being first*, which I know will 'be industriously thrown in his way, and contrasted with that secon-'dary and subordinate situation, to which they will insinuate he must 'be confined while he continues to act in the general system.' (*Mem. of Fox*, vol. i. p. 325.)

are quite willing to admit that a system of government which is suited to England may not be suited to countries differently situated; we still think that, whenever the pressure of the despotic regimen is at all relaxed,—looking to the fact that man is a historical animal — the parliamentary form of government, combined with a hereditary king, offers the best chance of permanent amelioration in the existing circumstances of the European States. If the time should ever arrive when an attempt should be made in the great Continental States to reach a popular system of government by this road, we earnestly exhort the parliamentary leaders to bear in mind, that the first object to be secured is *some* form of parliamentary or corporate government, *some* species of rule which is not dependent on the will of one man, but which lodges the supreme power in a body; *some* constitution which ensures public debate in a legislative chamber, freedom of the press, and security against arbitrary imprisonment. When this great and paramount object has been accomplished, and a habit of regular government, upon these principles, has been formed, the time will have arrived for deciding the proportions of the aristocratic and democratic elements in the constitution, and for raising questions on which the anti-despotic party are likely to be divided. But it is premature to stir those questions, and to dwell upon the refinements of a free Government, the *apices* of a constitutional system, before its foundations have been laid. It is premature to dispute about accidents before we have secured the substance. The leaders of liberal parties should bear in mind that despotism is the normal state of mankind, and free governments the rare exception; and that, in all unsettled states of society, the tendency to a despotic form of government is strong and constant.

We have made these remarks with a view to the future, not to the past; not for the purpose of blaming the popular leaders in the late movements on the Continent, but for the purpose of exhorting them to a different course hereafter. Much wonder has been expressed at the failure of parliamentary government in the recent experiments in the Continental States: and an opinion has even been promulgated that the Anglo-Saxon race are alone fitted for free institutions. The Republican Governments of antiquity and the middle ages — which, whatever may have been their defects, were the best Governments of their respective times — prove that Free Government is not the monopoly of a privileged race: and the failure of the late attempts may, as it seems to us, be completely explained by the neglect of those precautions which an intelligent study of the history of England during the reign of George the Third is calculated to suggest.

ART. II.—1. *Annual Report of the Blind School, St. George's Fields.* 1853.

2. *Letter to the Rt. Hon. Lord Wharncliffe on the Phonetic System for the Blind.* By J. H. FRERE, Esq. 1843.

3. *Annual Report of the Pennsylvanian Institution for the Instruction of the Blind.*

4. *Tangible Typography, or how the Blind read.* By E. C. JOHNSON, Esq. 1853.

5. *The Lost Senses.* By J. KITTO. (1845.)

6. *Observations on different Modes of Educating the Blind.* By Rev. W. TAYLOR, F.R.S. 1853.

7. *A History of France for Children.* By Lord CRANBORNE.*

8. *Des Aveugles. Considérations sur leur Etat Physique, Moral et Intellectuel.* Par P. A. DUFAU. Paris: 1850.

'NO *man becomes blind*,' says the proverb, '*by merely shutting* '*his eyes; nor does a fool always see by opening them.*' Yet, in spite of Sancho and the proverb, when we think or reason about the blind, we are apt to judge of them as simply having their eyes shut, while we have our's open; and that therein lies the great difference between us. This is but a hundredth part of the difference.

'*Eyes and No-eyes*,' says didactic Mr. Mavor, 'made together 'a tour, in which Eyes saw everything, and No-eyes nothing;' notwithstanding which stern truth No-eyes was not a blind man —certainly not Mr. Holman, who, in spite of total blindness, has visited and described half the known countries of the world. Let us further illustrate the case from life. Mr. Onesimus Smith has for a neighbour Mr. Cassio Brown. Mr. Smith caught a cold in his eyes some six or seven years after his first appearance in the Smithian halls, and became totally blind; while his neighbour Brown's eyes are still, at forty, as keen as a hawk's, and scorn the aid of glasses. It is a winter evening, and Mr. Brown sits reading in his library. He has mastered three chapters of metaphysics, and now closes his eyes for a moment to ponder on the last and toughest. As his bodily eyes close, his mental eyes open; and the very objects which he but now beheld, reappear almost as they fade away.† He still sees

* Lord Cranborne, since childhood, has been totally blind.

† Malebranche, when he wished to think intensely, used to close his window-shutters in the daytime, excluding every ray of light;

the printed page which he was reading a minute ago; opposite, over the fire-place, still appears to hang that incomparable likeness of himself as the President of the Little Pedlington Archery Club, in full uniform; he can still *see* the ruddy fire as well as hear it crackle, and the shadow on the wall still flickers in the uncertain light. On whichever of these points his thoughts chance to dwell — metaphysics, archery, his own noble mien as President, the price of coals, or the theory of shadows — of that very one may his eyes, though closely shut, still behold a visible symbol: 'Non cernenda sibi lumina clausa vident.'

But suppose Mr. O. Smith under precisely similar circumstances, save that he is blind. He too reads metaphysics, and is given to meditation. He leans back in his chair, and thinks on the last tough chapter. He has been blind since he was eight years old, and is now forty. He cannot remember, with any accuracy, the shapes of the thousand objects of sight which greet the traveller through little Pedlington, though he can with ease find his way through every part of the village. He knows where to turn off from the main road to the stile across the fields, precisely where the pump stands outside Firkins the grocer's door; and can even *run* without danger through the paternal mansion of the Smiths. He is well acquainted with all the details of the room in which he sits, can find almost any one volume that is wanted, and is aware of the portrait over the fire-place.* But when he leans back to muse on that last tough chapter of metaphysics, no sudden change takes place further than *this*, that a minute ago he was reading, *now* he is thinking, or not, as the case may chance.

But no visions of shadows on the wall, of printed type, or

---

and, for a like reason, Democritus *is said* to have put out his eyes in order that he might philosophise the better;—which latter story, however, it should be observed, though told by several ancient writers, is doubted by Cicero (De Fin. v. 39.), and discredited by Plutarch (De Curiosit. c. 12.) Speaking on this point, M. Dufau (the Manager of the famous French Schools) says,—'Lorsque nous 'voulons ajouter accidentellement à notre force habituelle d'attention, 'nous fermons les yeux, nous nous faisons artificiellement aveugles. 'Diderot tenait souvent en parlant les yeux entièrement clos, et sa 'parole avait alors, au dire de la Harpe, une éloquence qui s'élevait 'quelquefois jusqu'au sublime.'

* There is now living in the county of York a gentleman of fortune, who, though totally blind, is an expert archer: 'so expert,' says our informant (who knows him well) 'that out of twenty shots with the 'long bow he was far my superior. *His sense of hearing was so 'keen, that when a boy behind the target rang a bell,* the blind archer 'knew precisely how to aim the shaft.'

page, of portrait, or of archery, are ready to spring up at a moment's notice to be scanned, or dismissed as intruders. Blank night shuts him on all sides as he reads; it still shuts him in when he has ceased to read. Of the very light, in which live all the rest of the world, he most probably can form little, if any, conception, but from its genial warmth as the sun greets him in his morning walk, or dies along the elm-tree avenue as he strolls at eventide through his father's park.

If his thoughts stray for a moment from metaphysics to the crackling *sound* of his fire, his mental vision may at once form such idea as it can of blazing coals, but it has no help in the conception from aught of the visible, external world. 'The 'world of the blind,' says Prescott, 'is circumscribed by the 'little circle which they can span with their own arms. All 'beyond has for them no real existence.' (*Essays*, p. 47.)

A man who has been blind from birth or even early childhood fails in realising even what light is, much less a blazing flame. In the same way he fails to realise, even remotely, descriptions of the stars, the starry heavens at night, the sun, the moon. He has scarcely any idea of distance; such words as '*the arched* '*canopy of heaven*,' which *seeing* men call boundless, convey to him, after all, but a vague and dreamy idea of space and distance, but not even a faint conception of the glorious spectacle which delights his fellow-men.

So again, of the sea he can form no accurate conception. 'I 'have been told,' said a poor blind man to us not long since, 'that the ocean is like an immense green field; but of what use 'is that? How do I know what a *field* is, or what *green* is?' (A blind companion had used this simile in trying to make him understand what the sea was like.) The words 'sea' and 'sky' therefore do not convey to the blind man the impression which they convey to us. *His* world, so to speak, is without sky or sea; but of such a world *we* can form no idea. The picture, therefore, now before Mr. Smith, however vague or imperfect, comes to him when summoned; but is the result rather of inward power than outward impression. He has no remembrance of the fire at which he burnt his fingers in the nursery some five and thirty years ago, save that it was hot and painful. He may remember sitting as a boy on the bench under the great walnut tree, but he cannot now call to mind even its colour, shape, or size; and still more faint is his remembrance of that striking portrait of Onesimus Smith, Sen., Esq., major in the Yorkshire Invincibles, which still hangs where his son was held up in nurse's arms to see it on the walnut wainscot of the dining-room. But it must not be forgotten, that although the

circle of which Prescott speaks is a narrow one, yet within that circuit the blind student has full sway, and that nothing is too distant for his intellect to gather even from far-off sources, and bring within his own range. Whatever object, therefore, rises in his thoughts to interfere with the metaphysical musings, rises up from within; and the very fact of its being thus isolated from the external world tends to render the mental vision, if not keener, yet more concentrated; as the rays of common light gathered into a focus burn the hand on which the hottest July sun shines harmlessly.

And thus it happens, that—on whatever subject—the blind man thinks with greater concentration and individuality of purpose than the student who has eyes; if he loses the help of external objects in forming certain conceptions or ideas, he gains by not being liable to their intrusion in tangible and solid reality, when not wanted.

How imperfectly, and with what difficulty, the blind realise space and distance, even if their sight be restored, may be seen from the following most interesting case, extracted from the 'Philosophical Transactions:'—

'The boy born blind, upon whom Cheselden so successfully 'operated, believed, when first he saw, that the objects touched 'his eyes, as the things which he felt touched his skin; conse- 'quently he had no idea of distance. He did not know the 'form of any object, nor could he distinguish one object from 'another, however different their figure or size might be: when 'objects were shown to him which he had known formerly by 'the touch, he looked at them with attention, and observed 'them carefully, in order to know them again; but as he had 'too many objects to retain at once, he forgot the greater part 'of them; and when he first learned, as he said, to see and 'know objects, he forgot a thousand for one that he recollected. 'It was two months before he discovered that pictures repre- 'sented solid bodies; until that time he had considered them as 'planes and surfaces differently coloured, and diversified by a 'variety of shades; but when he began to conceive that these 'pictures represented solid bodies, in touching the canvas of a 'picture with his hand, he expected to find something in reality 'solid upon it: and he was much astonished when, on touching 'those parts which seemed round and unequal, he found them 'flat and smooth like the rest. He asked which was the sense 'that deceived him, the sight or the touch? There was shown 'to him a little portrait of his father, which was in the case of 'his mother's watch; he said that he knew very well that it 'was the resemblance of his father; but he asked, with great

'astonishment, how it was possible for so large a visage to be 'kept in so small a space? as that appeared to him as impossible 'as that a bushel could be contained in a pint.'

It is but natural, therefore, to find that the blind, as a class, when once they have been roused to exertion, and their education has been really commenced, even in every day practical life act with greater individuality and concentration of purpose than many *cleverer* friends who have eyes. If neglected, and left alone, they will doubtless stagnate in mind and body. The darkness surrounding the body seems to penetrate and pervade the mind; and not only does it appear to them that the day is over, and the night come when none may work, but that the sun is set, and that there can be no moon or stars to govern the night.

But only once convince the blind man that He who made the day made also the night—that very night in which he lives and is to work — show to him but one star of hope — point out to him but one work which he can and ought to do — make your demonstration practical, and show that the work proposed can be done by him — raise in short one spark of interest in what the hand or the head is to do, and it will soon be done with might and earnestness. The one solitary, dim spark will increase in brilliancy and size; soon other stars will dawn upon the sight where but now was darkness, as each heaviest, darkest cloud 'Unfolds her silver lining to the night,' and the whole heaven soon glows with innumerable points of fire.

But to return to the prose reality of the matter, and cut short our moonlit walk. When one point of interest is thoroughly roused in the mind of a blind child of whatever age, the work quickly progresses, whatever that point of interest be. It may chance to be in the art of making a basket, or a pair of shoes; in the learning of a psalm, or the art of using a knife; it may be of walking uprightly, or finding his way through the asylum into which he is received, from room to room of his new home. It matters little where the interest is first roused, provided it be real, and is at once cherished into active life and exertion. Much will depend on the habit and disposition of the learner, his previous mode of life, his parents' occupation, ignorance and poverty, neglect or care of their child.

One boy will, we find, learn in a month what it takes another a year to acquire, and which perhaps a third is never able to acquire. Outside one of the workshops in St. George's Fields is a long covered pathway for the use of the pupils in wet weather, and on it may be often seen some forty or fifty boys and men promenading with as much ease and regularity in twos

and threes as if they had the keenest sight. At a second glance, however, you will see that here and there in the crowd are one or two who, if they lose the arm of their companions, are at once in great difficulty. The new comers are to be distinguished at the first glance. They stoop much, and walk with a shambling, shuffling step, as if in fear and dread of suddenly meeting some unseen obstacle, and so coming down with a crash. Yet it is not so with all the new comers. *One*, a smart active boy, who perhaps has had companions at home, learns in a few days the exact line of the covered way, never swerves from it, nor wanders into the wrong side of the path so as to interfere with the stream going in the other direction, though his fellow-pupil admitted at the same time cannot walk five yards alone without fear and trembling. Another learns *to run*, cleverly, from one angle of the building to another, as if his fingers *saw* the handle of the door which they so readily and exactly find; while a fourth for many months never gets out of a zigzag when he tries to walk alone, and is certain to fall if he attempts to run.

A similar difference exists among them in the acquirement of any art or knowledge. The blind boy *generally* excels in some one special department. Thus, the clever basket-maker is no musician; he persists in singing G while the organ strongly exhorts him to sing A, and yet hears no discord; while his companion, who entered the school with him, and can sing and play scales major and minor from A to Z, elaborates the tenth part of a basket in a month, and in great misery cuts his finger when he should be splitting a withy or chipping off an irregular and stray end at the edge of his work.

But whichever phase of character A. or B. presents, the one favourite pursuit is carried on with zeal and diligence. If B. has strong intentions of outbasketing all other framers of twigs, A. threatens to become a second Handel, and C., who prides himself on his powers of memory and mental calculation, bids fair to make mnemonic Major Beniowski retire from Bow Street in despair.* Zeal and diligence may, therefore, be noticed as

---

* This characteristic faculty is, according to Father Charlevoix, turned to good account in Japan, where the public records of the empire are committed to memory by chosen blind men.

We are ourselves acquainted with an old blind mat-maker, who can repeat Thomson's 'Seasons,' and one or two other long poems, besides having an almost equally ready knowledge of several of the Gospels. Very recently a son was added to a friend's family, and news of the birth was brought to the blind man, who instantly set about calculating how often the child's birthday would fall on a

special characteristics of the blind who are being *educated* in a true sense. Many of them, too, possess that spark of what, at first sight, appears like vanity, but is an essential element in the composition of all men who attain any degree of skill, whether in the making of an osier basket or in ruling a great nation.

Every man, when once any one power of mind has been thoroughly trained and is ready for action—if he be really in earnest—feels and knows in his own heart that he possesses this power. He knows that he *can* do, and therefore does. Like the poet—the true ποιητὴς, *doer* or *maker*—he too feels

> 'The energy divine within him shrined
> Bid every glowing thought in *action* live.'

In such as these it appears as a high and noble self-consciousness of real living power within them, widely differing from mere empty vanity. Vanity sees nothing higher or greater than self. The true consciousness of power is not a confession of self, but of Him who made man, and placed in him the power to act and to feel conscious of the power; and that from Him comes the power, whether to make baskets or rule empires, to weave a door-mat, or

> 'To melt the soul to very tears of joy,
> With never-ending waves of melody
> From Music's deep, unfathomed sea.' *

How nobly Milton realised this, and in his days of darkness felt and owned the presence of a Power greater than himself, may be seen in the following grand words:—'Et sane haud 'ultima Dei cura cæci sumus; qui nos, quominus quicquam 'aliud præter ipsum cernere valemus, eo clementius atque 'benignius respicere dignatur. Nos ab injuriis hominum non 'modo incolumes, sed pene sacros divina lex reddidit, divinus 'favor; nec *tam oculorum hebetudine quam cœlestium alarum 'umbrâ has nobis fecisse tenebras videtur;* factas illustrare rursus 'interiore ac longe præstabiliore lumine haud raro solet.' (*Defens. Secund.*) That the gloom of the blind man's life

---

Monday up to the year 1900. In a short time he had accurately settled the matter. He is now, though upwards of sixty, trying to learn to read. But his fingers are become hard and horny with work.

* 'There is in the heart of all men a working principle,—call it ambition, or vanity, or desire of distinction, the inseparable adjunct of our individuality and personal nature, and flowing from the same source as language,—the instinct and necessity in each man of declaring his particular existence, and thus of singularising himself.' (*Coleridge's Omniana*, p. 375.)

should not be from mere dulness of vision, but rather '*from the* '*shadow of the Divine wings*' which overspread him, is indeed a conception worthy of Milton himself.

We do not, of course, assert that the blind, as a class, possess this noble self-consciousness in a greater degree than, but only in common with, other men. In them as in others empty vanity may usurp its place; but on the whole we imagine that the higher tone is not unfrequent, and is one secret of their success, though casual observers are apt to call it the result of mere cleverness.

There is an idea, we believe, extant among persons that the blind as a class are inferior in actual power of mind* as well as in attainment; as if with their eyes their mental faculties had also become blinded—that a sort of blight had passed over the powers of mind, destroying at once both keenness and vigour. People are apt to say, 'O he is blind,' just as they say, 'he is 'an idiot.' It would be easy to prove the injustice of such words at once, but we prefer leaving plain facts to speak for themselves in a future page of these remarks. It is sufficient here to say that the idea is altogether erroneous, arising from ignorance of the facts of the case, or a knowledge of the blind derived only from books.

If we sum up the characteristics of the blind as a class†, we shall find them to be thoughtful and diligent, with peculiar keenness and sensibility of mind and feeling; shy of expressing their thoughts or feelings before strangers; grateful for every little kindness, and equally tenacious in the remembrance of the least slight; not seldom conceited and opinionated. They are affectionate to one another, and to any who will take an interest in their cares or pleasures. One peculiarity—not to be forgotten—is, that they hate to be compassionated,—to be supposed to be so frightfully different from other people.

'*Pity the poor Blind*' is the cry of the professional mendicant who haunts the kerbstone behind a dog. His blindness is his stock in trade,—at once his misfortune and his most excellent property; though even in his case one's pity is all in vain until

* This idea Dufau contradicts strongly, even in the case of those born blind:—'C'est toutefois un fait bien digne de remarque que la 'defectuosité de l'instrument intellectuel chez les aveugles-nés ne 'depasse presque jamais certaines limites. On a observé qu'il est fort 'rare qui'ls soient atteints sinon d'imbécillité du moins de folie.'

† 'En somme,' says Dufau, 'l'attention, la comparaison, et le rai- 'sonnement, l'abstraction, l'analyse et la mémoire, tous les élémens de 'la raison humaine sont en eux comme en nous; pas un n'y manque.' (P. 47.)

it assume a metallic form and drop into the canine basket. But the poor blind who are once placed above being tempted to this degradation do not like being lamented over with pitiful tears or words, or compassionated with sentimentalities. They will gladly listen if you take an interest in what they do, and talk to them as workers of an ordinary kind. But they feel that they are of the same flesh and blood as you are, and you must identify yourself with them if you would hear of their difficulties, successes, joys, and troubles. Otherwise the task will be one of difficulty, and unproductive of the least intimacy.

So keenly do they feel their oneness with other people, and so disinclined are they in general to allude, even remotely, to their own loss of sight, that among blind children such phrases as the following are constantly exchanged:—'Have you *seen* 'Martha Smith?' 'I *saw* Robert in the basket shop.' 'Sarah, 'have you *seen* my bonnet? (here the chapel bell rings); just *see* 'if it is in your room.' As may be therefore imagined, they take great interest in listening to descriptions of many circumstances and things which it appears at first thought persons without sight could not at all realise. We happen to know that the pupils of the Blind School in St. George's Fields listened with great interest to several very lengthy printed accounts of the funeral pageant of the Great Duke. Many of them also visited the Great Exhibition, and were delighted with the wonders of the place, of which they still talk.* Of this thoughtful and ingenious race of people there are in Great Britain about twenty-five thousand†, of whom a small proportion, certainly not one half, are being educated, as the majority of the whole number belong to an indigent class for whom little has been attempted, and still less has been done. Shut

* Our readers will perhaps be surprised to learn that the blind were exhibitors at the world's mart; a large stand being entirely filled with their work in rugs, mats, and baskets, besides knitting in wool and silk, and hair-work of the finest kinds.

† Golownin's estimate of the number of blind persons in Japan appears to us impossibly large; he sets down 36,000 to the capital, Jeddo, alone!

The proportion of the blind to the whole population is rather higher in America than in Europe. In Egypt the average is still higher, probably on account of ophthalmia; being computed to amount to *one blind person in every hundred;* in Norway, one in a thousand; in Great Britain rather less than in Norway. All the blind do not seem to feel their privation with equal acuteness; different causes of blindness seeming to involve different degrees of suffering; those born blind feeling their loss far less deeply than others who can form *a real idea of vision.*

out as the blind are from the thousand channels of information and improvement open to the rest of mankind in the world of books, of course the first object has been to teach them to read, especially to read the Scriptures. For unfortunately scarcely any other book has yet been brought within the reach of the *poor* blind. We say unfortunately, because *The Book* of all books has by this means been subjected to much usage—to which any book may be degraded—at once unbecoming and unworthy of its sacred character and contents.

'*The Scriptures*,' says the author of 'Tangible Typography,' (a work which we gladly recommend to our readers' careful perusal) 'are now read more frequently as an exercise, and a means for 'mastering a system, than as a spiritual comfort, guide, and 'consolation; especially in schools, where portions of the Bible 'are used as the only class book, and where, consequently, 'monotony begetting indifference, and indifference want of 'respect, the reading of the Word of God is apt to be regarded 'as a task, rather than a pleasure and a privilege.' (P. 8.)

And again,—'The books printed for their use are few in 'number, deficient in variety, and not procured without diffi-'culty even at a large expense.' (*Ibid.*)

'The blind are almost entirely without works of interest or 'amusement.' (*Ibid.*)

It is evident, therefore, that much remains to be done before the blind, as a class, can be raised from their present dark and dreary condition. Two thirds of the *twenty-five thousand* in England cannot yet read (p. 10.), and those who can have their small library rendered still smaller by the multiplicity of systems on which the books have been printed. These systems are, it appears, so utterly different from each other as to require separate and special study before they can be deciphered. Learning a new system is, in fact, to a blind man, like learning a new language. That our readers may the more readily understand this, we propose giving a brief sketch of the different systems now in use among the blind in Great Britain; and then as briefly noticing what else has been done for them in other matters of mental and bodily education.

All printing for the blind is in *raised*, or, as it is called, *embossed* type, at once perceptible to the touch. The different systems may be subdivided into two distinct classes, which have been severally named *Arbitrary* and *Alphabetical;* the first in which arbitrary characters are used to represent letters, sounds, or words, and the second in which the ordinary Roman letters are employed.

Modifications of the two great classes of Systems may be thus subdivided: —

| *Alphabetical.** | *Arbitrary.* |
|---|---|
| 1. Alston's system. | 1. Lucas's system. |
| 2. The American. | 2. Frere's system. |
| 3. French alphabetical. | 3. Moon's. |
| 4. Alston modified. | 4. Le Système Braille. |
| | 5. Le Système Carton. |

Of the alphabetical systems Alston's is the chief and best. 'After long experience,' writes the adapter, Mr. Alston of Glasgow, 'I am convinced that arbitrary characters, however 'ingeniously constructed, throw unnecessary obstacles in the way 'of the blind.' He therefore chose the ordinary Roman capital letters, as being at once the simplest, and most easily felt, — the most likely to be *remembered* by any blind scholar who had once enjoyed sight; in which, too, any one with sight, able to read ordinary type, could with ease instruct those deprived of the use of their eyes. The importance of this latter advantage cannot, we imagine, be over-estimated; and we are bound to admit that Mr. Alston's choice of the Roman letters is, on the whole, a wise one. At p. 35-36. of Mr. Johnson's valuable little work, we find the following *reasons why* Alston's, as now in use, or slightly modified, is the system best suited for general adoption: —

'The blind already form a peculiar and distinct class of people, and it is most desirable on every account not to render them more isolated or peculiar, but rather to make them, as far as may be, one in advantages, duties, and enjoyments with their fellow-men. The

* One most curious and ingenious system of writing and reading is that of a knotted string, invented some years since by two blind men then in the Edinburgh School. We have but space to note that the letters are on this system divided into seven classes, each class and each letter being represented by a knot or knots of a peculiar kind, easily distinguished by the touch. The system is obviously more curious than useful. It would be an interesting task to compare it with the '*Quipos*,' or *knotted records* anciently kept by the Peruvians, before the era of Spanish discovery.

In the system of *raised* characters first adopted for the use of the blind, the Illyrian or Sclavonian alphabet was employed, probably on account of the *square* form of the letters, for this reason more easily detected. These soon gave way to solid letters (Roman) of wood which were made to slide into a frame.

Archbishop Usher tells us of his being thus taught to read by two *blind* aunts.

system of embossed printing for their use, therefore, should embrace at least the following features:—

'1. It must resemble as nearly as possible the type in ordinary use among those who have eye-sight;

'(*a*) that the blind scholar, in learning to read, may have every possible help from words which he *may* have formerly *seen*, but which *now* his fingers must decipher:

'(*b*) that he may derive help in learning from any one who can read an ordinary book; or, if needful, that his friend may be able to read to him.

'2. It must present the words correctly spelt in full, that when he learns to write, he may do so in a correct manner which *others* can read.

'3. The raised characters must be clear, sharp, and well-defined, which the finger, hardened by long work, and the keen soft touch of the little child, may be alike able to discern.

'The only system which can ever offer such advantages as these must clearly be some modification of Alston's system, or the lower-case type.' (P. 36.)

To the same effect speaks the Rev. W. Taylor of York, probably one of the highest authorities on all points connected with the blind. '*No alphabet*,' he says, '*seeming to possess so many* '*advantages as the Roman alphabet.*' '*I would discourage all* '*systems of embossing*,' says Mr. Hughes, the Governor of the Blind School at Manchester, '*which could not be read and taught* '*by seeing persons.*' And to a like purport writes Mr. Morris, the Superintendent of the Blind School at York.

The American books are all printed on a modification of Alston's system, and are a strong testimony on its behalf; while the words of the famous Abbé Carton speak in its favour still more strongly. The Abbé is the Governor of 'L'Institution 'des Sourds-muets, et des Aveugles,' at Bruges, and having devoted a long life to the study of the blind, must be admitted as a valuable authority. He thus writes:—'En effet, si un 'caractère, connu des clairvoyants, est employé dans l'impres-'sion en relief pour les aveugles, ces infortunés sont plus rap-'prochés des autres hommes que s'ils se servaient d'un caractère 'inconnu de ceux qui les entourent; quoiqu'on en dise, il nous 'en coûte d'apprendre un nouvel alphabet pour l'enseigner à des 'enfants, et cette difficulté rebutera plusieurs personnes qui, sans 'cela, se seraient occupées de cet enseignement. Diminuer la 'difficulté qu'auraient les clairvoyants à connaître l'alphabet des 'aveugles, est réellement travailler en faveur des aveugles. Le 'plus grand nombre d'aveugles se trouve parmi la classe pauvre, 'et le plus grand malheur des aveugles est leur isolement;

'tous nos efforts doivent tendre à les rapprocher de nous, et à 'rendre leur instruction aussi semblable à la nôtre qu'il est 'possible, et à commencer cette instruction aussi vite que l'on 'peut.'

One would imagine that such testimony as this was sufficient to decide any question the settlement of which depended on common sense and reason. But, strange to say, such is far from being the case. It is not even yet decided that one of the alphabetical systems shall be adopted. It appears indeed settled that the blind, as a class, shall be educated; and, as a first step, shall be taught to read. But eager and unwearied partisans are disputing on the very threshold of the work *how* the blind shall be taught,—'*Whether*,' says Tangible Typography, '*by Brown's infallible stenographic, Smith's unrivalled* 'abbreviations, Jones's unsurpassed contractions, Robinson's easy 'symbols, or any other of the numerous perfect systems which, 'unfortunately for the blind, have been lately invented.' And meanwhile, the work for which all are striving is greatly impeded. The strength and success which unity of purpose and of action alone can give, are wanting; and the education of the blind is impeded.

*The American Books* are all printed on a modification of Alston's plan, and, as a whole, may be regarded as successful, being smaller in bulk and cheaper in cost than those published in England. The type adopted is clear and sharp, being a slight modification of what printers call lower-case. Further notice it scarcely needs from us, as the books are not to be procured in England.

The books printed by M. Dufau*, at the great Institution for the Blind at Paris, before the employment of an arbitrary system of *dots*, were rounded lower-case letters with Roman capitals, and, in the Jurors' Report of the May Exhibition, are highly spoken of. But that type has been abandoned, and an arbitrary one of raised dots adopted in its place, apparently without cause, and with little success.

*Lucas's System* professes to do for the blind reader what shorthand would do for one who, ignorant of the ordinary alphabet,

* M. Dufau is the author of a most valuable work on the blind, entitled 'Des Aveugles. Considérations sur leur état physique, moral 'et intellectuel,' which, we regret to say, has reached us only too late to be of service while writing the following pages. A few brief notes is all that it now lies in our power to give by way of extract. His work is dedicated to the Crown Prince of Hanover, who is totally blind.

should attempt a stenographic one. (The case of an ordinary short-hand writer who can read and write in the manner of ordinary mortals is not an analogous one.) We are, however, surprised to find that short-hand for the blind, contrary to all other stenographic systems, is no saver of *space*. The New Testament, printed in the American type, occupies 430 pages, in Alston's system, 623, in Lucas's, 841. Whatever, therefore, Lucas omits, his omissions serve to increase the bulk of his productions. '*Minuendo auget*,' would be a good Lucasian motto.

'All letters,' says Lucas, 'not necessary to the sound are 'omitted; as *da* for *day*, *mit* for *might*, *no* for *know*,' &c. Now, allowing the first of these omissions to pass muster, it does not seem to have struck the Lucasian brain that mit spells *mit* quite as much as *might*, unless he abolish all *mittens*, *mittimuses*, and *mitigations* by stenographic decree. For our own part, we become tenderly anxious to know the transmutation and ultimate fate of our old friends *lit* and *light*, *spit* and *spite*, *wit* and *wight*, *sit* and *sight*, *bight* and *bit*, *fight* and *fit*, and many others equally dear. Do they obtain, as they seem to require, separate legislation for each of their peculiar necessities? Or, if not, what law can equally apply to cases so widely differing? Who is the presiding Master in Chancery for the nonce,—the blind disciple, or his quick-sighted stenographic teacher? N o may certainly stand for *know*, and eir for *heir;* but what shall we say of *Rule 2.*:—*When the sound of a word is decidedly different from the spelling, the spelling is altered*, as *shurly* for surely, *sed* for said, *laf* for laugh, *brawt* for brought? Allowing a Lucasian to *laf* instead of laugh, it seems a strange and unwise plan to teach a child an incorrect way of spelling some thousands (at least) of words in the English language, simply because he is afflicted with blindness. It is, in fact, saying to him,—now, if by perseverance you ever master stenography and survive Lucas, you shall also, if you attempt caligraphy, learn to write in a barbarous dialect which your friends who can see can neither understand nor decipher.

Of course, if surely becomes *shurly*, and surety *shurty*, sugar ought to be metamorphosed into *shugar*. Final *ees* are ignominiously cut off, as *giv*, *gav*, *fac*. Some words are expressed by a single character. Thus *q* stands for queen and question, *y* for yet and yesterday, *m* for me, or my mother, *v* for verily and vanity, *P. H.* for six or Pharisee or sixth, and so on *ad infinitum*, until one expects to find at the end of the list, *L* for *Lucas*, *lamentable*, and *labyrinth*. Let us construct a short sentence in

Lucasian dialect*, with its 'various readings' in full, for the exercitation of a blind scholar.

| *Lucasian Symbols,* | H. | ma. | y. | sav. | m. | w. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Various Interpretations or Readings. | 1. He. | may | yet | save | me | with (we) | patience (up). |
| | 2. Have | — | yesterday | — | mother | world | upon. |
| | 3. Hither | — | ye | — | amongst | word (will) | put. |

No horn-book ever yet devised contained such horrors as these, and the bitterness of Mavor, though greater than that of aloes, never, we fancy, appeared so terrible as a dose of Lucas would have done if it had dawned on our juvenile eyes in Lesson 6. of words of three syllables. Four other Tables of Rules and Directions follow the above, as an Introduction to an alphabet of a purely arbitrary character, and even to a person of sharp eyesight as hopelessly undecipherable as a wedge inscription from the banks of the Tigris. For some centuries past most civilised nations have been content to use the old Roman letter, with slight, if any, modifications. The difficulties of that system have been considered sufficient for the distraction of young Europe in general. It remained for the advocates of stenography for the blind to contrive for their especial behoof a system more complicated, elaborate, and full of difficulty than mortals of ordinary vision can understand or decipher without much juvenile suffering.

But in spite of these difficulties, many blind persons have learned to read by this system; a fact not so difficult to understand when it is noted that the society who print these books at their own cost, have also expended much time and labour in teaching pupils to read them. With time, talent, and perseverance, an earnest teacher may instruct a willing scholar on any given system, however elaborate or however faulty. Whether with a far less expenditure of time and labour the same pupils would not have learned to read by a common alphabetical system, is a totally different question. It is sufficient here to say that the

* The first verse of St. John's Gospel translated from *Lucas* into ordinary letters stands thus, and is sufficiently puzzling to a reader with eyes:—

in. t. bgini. ws. t. wrd. a. t. w. ws. w. g. a. t. w. ws. g.

In reading, the blind scholar applies his touch most keenly to the *tops* of the letters,—and this part of the raised surface is generally found to be depressed or rubbed away sooner then any other, affording another argument against stenographic systems. For, although when the upper part of a *Roman letter*, as P, M, or A, be rubbed away, it may still be deciphered, a short-hand symbol in a like state of dilapidation is a hopeless puzzle.

Lucasian disciples had a chance of learning to read, if with difficulty, at a slight cost, and were glad to avail themselves of the chance, be it what it might. They have learned to read, therefore, by a very abbreviated and ambiguous kind of writing, sufficient perhaps for the *seeing*, who when learning short-hand have been previously instructed in reading, and yet very ill adapted to be the first and only reading taught to the blind.

'In a new stenographic alphabet for the blind Mr. Lucas had 'an opportunity of framing a perfect one, containing a simple 'character for each of the elementary sounds of the English 'language; but instead of this he formed one deficient in no less 'than ten and redundant in eight characters.' (*Letter to Lord Lansdowne*, p. 6.)

To the blind the abbreviation of words, so as to bring them at once within the compass of the touch, is doubtless an object of the first importance; and this abbreviation is professedly the main principle of Lucas's system. But this very principle has been but partially applied. To the true elementary sounds ch, sh, and th, Lucas has appropriated a single stenographic character, but he has left the other ten, viz. the five long vowels, and five diphthongs, to be distinguished in his system, as in our orthography,— if distinguished at all,— by the addition of a second unsounded character. He seems to prefer, in practice, brevity to perspicuity; and rather than add the unsounded letter necessary to distinguish the long vowel from the short one, he makes no distinction between them; and thus 'light,' 'rays,' and 'east' are metamorphosed into 'lit,' 'ras,' and 'est.' He has uselessly copied in his embossing the anomalies of our own common orthography; but only makes his system more complicated to the blind reader by using four different stenographic characters for the sound of (f) as ff, ph, gh; two for (s) and two for (l), while he violates all consistency by amazing his disciples with such orthography as '*wid bems of lit in the skis*' for '*wide beams 'of light in the skies.*' Well, therefore, may Mr. Frere remark, 'such a system as this is neither orthographical nor phonetic; it 'accords neither with spelling nor speech, and when made in-'telligible by being rendered into common characters, equally 'offends both the eye and ear.' (*Letter*, p. 9.)

Of Mr. Frere's own system, which is also a stenographic and arbitrary one, we are glad to speak very much more favourably. Whatever faults it may have, its ruling principle is fully and impartially applied; and mere consistency is a decided advantage. It is based on the phonetic principle, or combination of elementary sounds; which sounds, says the author, 'consist of the 'pure vowel sounds and the pure sounds of the consonant; which

'latter are expressed in the final sounds of the words,' according to the order of the short-hand alphabet. Instead of our old placid and sufficiently abstruse A B C we must now call to mind that more modern friend (though long since dead and buried) '*the fonetic Nuz*;' and be introduced to sounds hissing, and sounds guttural, gushings, breathings, and aspirations, which are represented by thirty-six characters. 'This system,' says its author, 'may be denominated a scientific representation of speech, 'the alphabet containing one character, and but one, for each 'of the simple sounds of the English language, whose only 'names are the sounds they represent; and each word being em-'bossed according to its actual pronunciation, the names of the 'characters combined, or sounded together, give the word; and 'the pupil is thus *nearly enabled to read as soon as he has learnt* '*his alphabet*.'

Thus writes Mr. Frere himself; and his words are well worthy of attention. After a long life of devotion to the blind, he is entitled to speak and to be heard. He has devoted, and still continues to devote his time, his talents, and his substance to their welfare, and has won from many a poor blind creature heart-felt gratitude and respect. But his system, like all other systems, has its faults,—of which his earnest and unwearied advocates do not seem aware. One fallacy contained in Mr. Frere's words above quoted we have italicised; 'the pupil is '*nearly enabled to read as soon as he knows his alphabet*.'

There is no royal road to learning to read,—for pupils with or without eyes,—by virtue of any system whatever. From the days of the first horn-book to this very hour of '*reading* '*made easy*,' '*spelling made play*,' when knowledge is offered to mankind without the trouble of learning, and sixpenny catechisms teach all things from Platonism to Pyrotechny,—there never has been a royal road. There never will be one. '*Read-*'*ing made easy*' is a rough, winding, difficult road, at the best. He that travels by it,—whoever be his guide,—must make up his mind to many difficulties, and the payment of many 'pikes,' before he reach his journey's end. We appeal confidently to our readers, whose name is Legion,—and 'may their shadow never 'be less,'—if it be not so. Is there one among them all who mastered the easy art of reading without some juvenile suffering, some weeping, and many a hopeless sigh; even long after the mysteries and woes of the alphabet were triumphantly passed? Who would not be a reader on Frere's system if his journey through the alphabet was to land him safely among words of three syllables? We fear that the sentence should stand thus, '*the pupil will in due time learn to read as soon as he has learned*

'*his alphabet.*' One of Frere's most earnest, able, and unwearied advocates, who daily devotes time and talent, as well as an entire heart, to the instruction of the poor blind, thus speaks of his system: — 'It omits all superfluous letters of our common 'spelling, and calls the consonants by the sounds they actually 'give instead of by their names; so that the pupil having learned 'the sign for each sound in the language has only *to pronounce* '*them, and he of necessity reads.*' This last remark is but a repetition of Mr. Frere's own words; and contains the same fallacy.

The same writer thus continues: — 'As compared to Alston's 'we should consider it only as an adjunct, but a necessary one; '*for such pupils as we teach would be totally incapable either of* '*feeling the letters, or of overcoming the difficulties of ordinary* '*reading and spelling.* It is the system for the ignorant and 'the incapable.' To this the advocates of Alston (*the Roman letter*) strongly reply that the case is not proved; but that the contrary view is in their opinion the true one,— viz., that Alston's system is quite as easily taught as Frere's; that it possesses the inestimable advantage of being understood and read by any one who can read ordinary print,— and thus is one strong check against the further isolation of the blind;— and moreover that '*the great majority of blind persons now in England who can* '*read do so on an alphabetical system.*'* This last fact, we must confess, argues strongly in favour of Alston. If Frere's system had been the easier and more expeditious of the two, surely the blind themselves are the very people to have discovered and profited by it long ago. Our own experience, formed chiefly from the testimony of the blind, leads us to believe that Alston's is as easily acquired as any other system, and when once acquired is the best. '*As an adjunct*' to Alston's, Frere's is a most useful system, but clearly not as a substitute for it. The laborious '*memoria technica*' is far too long and too complicated; standing greatly in need of all the author can say in its defence at p. 14. of his letter. He appears himself to feel the

* Vide circular of *the Society for printing Books for the Use of the poor Blind*, 24. Arundel Street, Strand.

Mr. Taylor, the skilful printer of Queen's Street, Lincoln's Inn, has, under the direction of the Rev. W. Taylor (formerly Superintendent of the Blind School at York), printed in embossed type for the blind, a life of James Watt. The type used is *lower case* and *Roman capitals*, and to the few blind who can distinguish such small letters will no doubt be a great boon. It is only to be regretted that the divided energies and means of the different printing societies are not united for one great and vigorous effort.

weakness of this part of his cause when he admits of its employment *being optional,* though he instantly adds that any system would be incomplete without such a provision. If any such provision be at all necessary, we think it would be of far more service in a very abridged form.

Mr. Frere's alphabet consists of *twenty-nine* signs, each of a purely arbitrary description, and having tagged on to it by way of description, some such 'morceau' for the memory of a child, — or an ignorant and older learner, — as the following: — '∠ ∂ *An angle, the points forwards, the straight line downwards,* 'the same as a half circle the points forwards, the dot downwards 'is *cheh* — [CHEH] is CHanged from a crescent by a dot on its 'lower limb — *atch, etch, itch, otch, utch.*' This versicle is to teach the blind scholar the sound of (*ch*), and must be repeated every time [CHEH] meets his fingers' ends; and this we are told is an easier process for the blind scholar, when multiplied by twenty-nine, than making acquaintance with our old sober friends, A, B, C, or H, &c., in the same guise as that known to the rest of mankind. To make the whole matter clearer to the learner, Mr. Frere, having divided the vowels into five long and five short, abolishes their representation in embossed printing, except by simple dots, which in different positions denote different vowels. That our readers may understand this rather obscure arrangement, we will take an example from page 5. of the Grammar: — '*Wherefore when the wise warn do not fools edify?*' being translated into Frere, becomes '. . . r-fr . .. n th . . z- '. . awn d. . flz. . nt ·d · · f- —.' We leave the further consideration of this dialect to our readers' own judgment and good sense, only adding that the twenty-nine versicles, with their respective *Angles* . >, are followed by '*XII Rules in verse for* '*supplying the omitted vowels,*' of which we feel bound to give one single specimen — the longest: —

RULE V.

'The final upper dot is *a* or *e*
The middle *i*, the lower *o* or *u*;
If you the vowel rightly would supply,
This is the thing you'll do:
When at the end no dot at all you see,
You'll understand and use the vowel *e*.
When letters two or more before the dot are seen,
You'll find the vowel out, and bring it in between.'

The other XI all partake more or less of the same character, chiefly relating to the mystical dots which symbolise vowel sounds. We do not imagine that the blind have any peculiar liking for rhymes of this kind, and certain we are that ordinary

learners of alphabets would be apt to regard them as so many drags on the wheel of progress. It is not a fair argument to say, as Mr. Frere in his letter does, that he has derived great help himself from the use of a similar memoria technica. That which is of great service to a well-read scholar like Mr. Frere may be a drag and a burden to a dull, ignorant, young or stupid blind scholar. '*A hint on the spot*,' says Gray, '*is worth a cart-load of recollections*.' The remark is trite but true. Suppose, therefore, instead of giving the pupil twelve rhyming rules, touching *lower*, *middle*, and *upper dots*, we simply present to his reading-finger a *hint* on the spot—*the old Roman* A. Let him feel it over in every part, and, if he pleases, associate with it the thought of a triangle, a pyramid, or any other figure of a like kind. To use his own phrase, let him '*look at it carefully*,' as Master Johnny or Charles in a Belgravian nursery is taught to do at great A; and when once he has fully realised its shape and dimensions the chances are ten to one that he remembers the mwithout needing any aid from a '*cart-load*' *of rhymes*. Rule XII. and last is,—

> 'Whene'er the proper rule don't yield you satisfaction,
> On trial you will find the word is a contraction.'

Of the other objections which have been with difficulty alleged against this system, we will only remark that they appear to us trivial and unfair. It is true that Mr. Frere, in rather a despotic way, banishes the sound of (*r*) in such words as horse and force; omits the vowels in all monosyllables, so that (*nt*) stands for net, not, or nut; (*st*) for sot, sit, sat, or set, &c.; that he orders all such terminations as *in|g*, *men|t*, *tio|n*, to appear only in *their final consonant;* that long words, such as Jerusalem, nevertheless, are severely clipped, reappearing in some such shape as *J—rsm*, *nv* : *rths*; but such minor defects as these are not incompatible with much excellence.

We do not attach much value to the lists of *cases* which we have heard cited with great earnestness on behalf of the various systems by their respective disciples. Such lists of names irresistibly remind us of other advertisements, wherein we read of certain, speedy, perfect, infallible, easy, pleasant, surprising, delightful cures of every ailment, affliction, and calamity under the sun. We have but to take the 'Thirty Golden Drops,'—

> 'When straightway through our feeble worn-out frame
> Rude blooming health at once resumes her sway.'

The cures appear so magically perfect, that one almost longs to enjoy the luxury of so complete and sovereign a remedy.

Without doubt many blind persons have mastered Frere's

system, and of these *a large proportion* are excellent readers, but the circumstances of the case are such that any other result would have long since consigned '*The Phonetic System*' to that abode of oblivion wherein our deceased friend the '*Fonetic Nuz*' now lies sepulchred and forgotten. The fact is that nine-tenths of Frere's readers have been taught either by himself or under his own immediate superintendence. Mr. Frere, and the friends who work with him and for him, possess talents, abundance of leisure, and the golden sinews of all success—money. These they devote nobly, heartily, unweariedly to the cause. Their very hearts and souls are in the work. What wonder that local success has crowned their labour of love? What system—having good for its object—would not thrive under such noble auspices, such unwearied diligence, such ardent zeal?

> 'With such right arms as these in such a cause,
> Who doubts of victory?'

We believe that Mr. Frere would think nothing of travelling fifty miles to teach a poor blind man to read his Bible, and we cannot doubt of success attending such a work. But the defects of a system are not a whit the less flagrant, however noble may be its author's charity, or earnest his labours.

In our younger days we were much afflicted with a treacherous memory; like the invalid's of another date, our motto might well have been '*plenus rimarum.*' In our distress we were recommended a dose of '*Grey's Memoria Technica.*' In this system letters stand for numerals, which numerals are appended to certain other *half words, themselves* being signs or symbols of certain *events* or *names* to be remembered. Barbarous enough was the jargon, but a few doses were said to be infallible. The first instalment we exhibit in its native crude form, as we first tasted it:—'*Crofth Deletok Abaneb Exafna Tembybe Cyrutz.*' Such was the primary and delicious morsel to be administered to the unfortunately weak and treacherous memory, after 'getting up' with considerable difficulty the details, rules, and principles of the system itself. Surely of all barbarous hexameters this was the most uncouthly barbarous. *Crofth* signified that the Creation took place B. C. 4004, *Deletok* the Deluge 2348, and so on to Cyrus himself metamorphosed into *Cyrutz.* All history, ancient and modern, was thus translated into barbarous hexameters, and a royal road at once opened to an intimate acquaintance with every date, large or small, since the days of Adam. It was merely to learn a few score (or hundreds, as the case might be,) of such pleasant hexameters, and '*the disciple would be no more troubled with weakness of memory, &c. for*

'*the rest of his life.*' In reply to this we have only to say, that the same amount of diligence, time, and labour expended on Old Testament history on a more ordinary, intelligible, and simple plan, would have infallibly taught the disciple all he wished to acquire in the matters of Adam, Noah, and Cyrus. The same argument applies to all systems encumbered with such a memoria technica. The same amount of time, labour, diligence, and hearty love expended in teaching an Alphabetical System would have produced not only equal but far greater results. There would have been a wider field for work, many more advocates, and consequently greater resources; and, above all, a more abundant harvest. There would have been no necessity for the teacher to get up the system beforehand; any one who could read, who had an hour to spare, and a heart to devote it to the blind, might at once have set to work. Unity of action would have been secured, and the success which attends unity of action would have followed.

But all these contingencies are now but profitless *would-have-beens;* and meanwhile Mr. Moon of Brighton is waiting. He has invented a system of reading which he naturally enough considers perfect. His advocates are few in number, but so strongly convinced of the superiority of their own views and the inferiority of every one else's, that to them he would appear to be

'Velut inter ignes
*Luna* minores.'

Let us hear what Mr. Moon says for himself:—'In order to 'avoid the complicated form of the Roman letter, and the still 'less discernible angular type,' he tells us 'that he has invented 'an alphabet, each letter of which is formed of two lines only; 'most of the letters bearing *a partial resemblance* to those in 'common use. Nine forms placed in different positions repre-'sent the whole alphabet and numerals, one form serving for 'A, V, K, L, and X, and another for E, L, M, and Y, while there 'are but four contracted forms, *ment*, *ing*, *tion*, and *ness*.'

Merely pausing to notice that the use of *mt* for *ment*, *tn* for *tion*, &c., is not a very profound or original idea, let us now see how far the claims of the advocates of this system are to be allowed. It is asserted, that the system is not an arbitrary but an alphabetical one; that so great a resemblance exists between the *Roman* and *Moonish* characters, that a teacher with eyes would readily, if not at once, read by Moon's system; and that, nevertheless, so simple are the Moonish characters, and so entirely are the '*intricacies of the Roman letters*' removed, that a blind scholar learns to read by them with greater facility than

by the ordinary A, B, C. We will leave both these questions to be decided by our readers on glancing at the following practical proofs: —

1. *Proof of* resemblance *between Moonish and Roman Letters.*

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Roman | P. | Q. | R. | S. | T. |
| Moonish | ⌐ | ⌒ | \ | / | — |

2. *Proof of Intricacies being removed.*

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Roman | H. | I. | J. | K. | L. |
| Moonish | ⊙. | \|. | ]. | <. | L. |

For our own part we must confess that we can neither discern the faintest trace of the resemblance sought to be established by No. 1., nor detect the removal of more than the least possible intricacy by No. 2. In fact, the system claims both the freedom of an arbitrary character, as well as the advantages of an alphabetical one; it professes to be at once like and unlike the same thing; and of necessity failing to establish any claim to either title, ends in being a mere mongrel. Of all the systems, moreover, this is among the bulkiest and most expensive, two characteristics which are alone sufficient to prevent its ever being adopted by any but its own few partisans.

If the New Testament, printed in all the five systems used in the English language, be taken as a standard of comparison, the following table will show the relative position of each.

| Systems. | Number of Vols. | Size. | Number of Pages. | Lines in Page. | Square Inches in Page. | Price. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | £ | s. | d. |
| American - - | 2 | 4to. | 430 | — | 117 | 0 | 16 | 0 |
| Alston's - - | 4 | „ | 623 | 42 | 90 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Lucas' - - | 9 | „ | 841 | 27 | 70 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Frere's - - | 8 | Ob. 4to. | 723 | — | 110 | 2 | 10 | 0 |
| Moon's - - | 9 | „ | — | 25 | 110 | 4 | 10 | 0 |

Mr. Moon, himself a blind man, deserves the highest praise for his labours in behalf of his fellow sufferers; but he might have done them a better service if he had led them into the highway *, — the old beaten highway, where fellow travellers who had eyes might have helped them on the journey, instead of

* It is true that the highway is often not the shortest road, — that with many a winding turn it presses steadily on up hill and down dale; 'but even highways which wind among mountains, by being much 'frequented, become gradually so smooth and commodious, that it is 'much better to follow them than to seek a *straighter* path by climb-'ing over the tops of rocks and descending to the bottom.' (*Descartes, on Method*, p. 57.)

taking them by a short cut across the fields. Stiles, brambles, and miry paths add neither to the pleasure, despatch, or profit of any journey; whether it be to escape uphill toil over the old *Roman road*, or the stones of a more recent piece of Mac Adam. Thus far, the different systems of embossed printing. Before, however, we quit this part of our subject we must again touch on the all-important point of price. Books of embossed printing, on whatever system, are chiefly for the benefit of the *poor* blind; their cost, therefore, is a question of primary importance. And in this age of cheap books, when a handsome library can be purchased for a few pounds, it is sad to think that the poor blind man who may chance to have mastered *the great task* of reading, cannot procure even the New Testament on any system at a less cost than 2*l.*; even on Frere's it will cost 2*l.* 10*s.*; and if he have grown up under the marine shadow of Mr. Moon, he will be mulcted of 4*l.* 10*s.* To all intents and purposes, therefore, the New Testament as a whole is utterly beyond the reach of those who most need it; the poorest and most ignorant of the blind. But it remains to be proved whether the printers of this age will not be able to introduce into printing for the blind improvements equal to those which mark every other branch of the art. To use a well-known phrase of logical precision, 'there is no antecedent improbability' why the blind should not have a pocket bible and prayer book, and therewith rejoice on many a happy Sunday. Neither is there any '*archidiaconal*' reason why they should not in a shilling volume wax melancholy over the sable miseries of Uncle Tom, or enjoy with wonder and delight the exciting adventures of that worthy mariner Robinson Crusoe.

We now come to another branch of our subject, and to note what has been done for the intellectual cultivation of the blind. Little more has been yet accomplished in England than teaching them to read*, write, and cipher, and even thus far only in the best of the schools with any degree of accuracy or skill. But the spirit of inquiry on their behalf is now spreading through the land. Many thoughtful and philanthropic men are expending

* But looking back on what Saunderson and Moyes achieved in the study of pure science and mathematics, there seems to be no reason why a few of the cleverest pupils who show any taste for such subjects should not be allowed to read a book or two of Euclid. That the attempt has been made, and not without success, we know. It is more than probable that the blind boy who fairly crosses the fatal '*Pons asinorum*,' realises the *pure reason* of his task far more fully than many a learner with eyes who again and again describes the dreadful angle on a greasy slate.

time and labour on a subject at once of interest and importance, and the next ten years will probably witness many useful discoveries in aid of so intelligent and afflicted a class.

As might naturally be supposed, the study of Music affords to the blind the purest and most unmixed pleasure; for in this pursuit are they least reminded of their infirmity. They find in it scope for the highest imagination, as well as the deepest feelings of religion; and when a blind man becomes a musician he is one with his whole *heart*, giving up to this study his entire energies and thoughts. At the Blind School in St. George's Fields, under the able direction of Mr. Turle of Westminster Abbey, many of the pupils have attained considerable skill both in vocal and instrumental music. A blind choir, guided and accompanied by a blind organist, performing choruses and solos from the works of Handel, Mozart, Mendelssohn, Bach, and other choice masters, is, indeed, a surprising spectacle; of which, however, our readers may themselves judge by attending one of their usual Monthly Concerts at the School. It is much to be regretted that difficulty should exist in procuring situations for blind organists, however well qualified, more especially as the pupil who becomes a musician rarely masters a trade, or shows much skill as a reader.

How the blind man writes is a problem of much easier solution than that of on what system he is to learn to read. The apparatus he uses is very simple. A small framework of wood, somewhat like a gridiron without a handle, is made to shut with a hinge on a flat square of mahogany, on which is laid the sheet of paper. Between the wooden bars thus resting on the paper, the writer inserts, one by one, each letter,—a small slip of deal with the Roman capital (thus ⬚) protruding from one end in points of metal. These points pierce the paper and produce corresponding letters; the operation being most like what children call 'pricking a pattern;' easily seen by the eye, and on the reverse side easily detected by the finger. The process is soon learned, and requires but a little patience, strength of finger, and a knowledge of spelling not Moonish or Lucasian.* Almost as easily the blind scholar learns to use a ciphering frame, which is of the ordinary size,—of metal in a frame of wood. Across it, in parallel lines at equal distances, run rows of pentagonal holes, like the cells of a honey-comb.

* Mr. Hughes, the Governor of the Blind School at Manchester, has invented a most ingenious typograph for the use of the blind. But its price at once removes it beyond the reach of all but the wealthy.

Into these holes he inserts his figure (2 or 8, or whatever it be), which consists of a small metal pentagonal plug terminating at one end in two forked points, at the other in a single obtuse point. When this plug is inserted into the hole, one end remains above the surface of the slate, and according to its position and the nature of the point, whether twofold or single, the finger of the blind scholar determines what figure is represented; the different positions being obviously ten in number. With an apparatus of this kind the scholar of an ordinary blind school manages to work simple sums in the four chief rules of arithmetic; but beyond a knowledge of these four comparatively few ever pass. It may be asked, 'Why cannot the blind in some 'degree emulate the skill and dexterity of Saunderson the 'famous blind mathematician? How, if they as a class never 'progress beyond the horrors of long division, could he, without 'ingenious frames and pentagonal plugs, calculate the doctrine of 'eclipses and comets, and explain those profound laws which 'guide the stars in their courses?'

Genius like Saunderson's ever devises ways and means of its own. It has a thousand little contrivances unknown to the ordinary student, who is content enough to travel along the beaten road which others have fashioned for him. Saunderson's whole machinery for computing was a small sheet of deal, divided by lines into a certain number of squares, and pierced at certain angles with holes large enough to admit a metal pin. With this simple board and a box of pins he made all his calculations; yet, in 1711, he was the friend of Sir Isaac Newton, and by his interest was elected Lucasian Professor of Mathematics at Cambridge. It is most probable that he never beheld the distant orbs of heaven, yet with the highest skill he reasoned of the laws which control them; unfolding and explaining the nature and beauty of light which he could not behold, and the glory of that bow in the clouds which he had never seen.*

Thus, also, was it with Huber, the blind philosopher of Geneva. His discoveries in the honied labours of bees have equalled, if not surpassed, those of any other one student of Nature. It remained for Huber, not only to corroborate truths which others had partially discovered, but also to detect and

* Of the keenness with which he entered on these studies, and the readiness with which he received outward impressions, M. Dufau gives a striking proof:—'Assistant un jour à des observations astro-'nomiques qui se faisaient en plein air, s'apercevait des momens où 'le soleil était obscurci par des nuages passagers, au point de pouvoir 'indiquer lui-même avec précision l'instant où il fallait suspendre ou 'poursuivre les observations.

describe minute particulars which had escaped even the acute observation of Swammerdam. It is true that others supplied him with eyes, but he furnished them with thought and intellect; *he saw with their eyes.* Thus he clearly proved that there are two distinct sets of bees in every hive, honey gatherers and the wax makers and nurses; that the larvæ of working bees can by course of diet be changed to queens; thus also he accurately described the sanguinary conflicts of rival queens; the recognition of old companions or of royalty by the use of the antennæ; thus he explained the busy hum and unceasing vibration of wing ever going on in the hive, as being necessary for due ventilation.*

One of the last incidents in the old man's life that seemed to rouse and interest him, was the arrival of a present of *stingless* bees, from their discoverer, Captain B. Hall. Unwearied diligence, and love for his work no doubt greatly aided him in all these discoveries; but genius effected for him what mere assiduity would never have accomplished. She taught him in a few minutes to swim the river of difficulty, while others spent hours in searching for a ford. It is the union of diligence and genius which has made so many a blind man famous among his brethren with eyes; not only the way to conceive but the hand to carry out and achieve, in its own way, the plan of wisdom and of beauty. Thus, Metcalf, the blind guide and engineer, constructed roads through the wilds of Derbyshire; thus, Davidson ventilated the deepest coal mines, and lectured on the structure of the eye; as did Dr. Moyes† on chemistry and optics; thus, Blacklock, poet and musician, master of four languages besides his own, wrote both prose and poetry with elegance and ease‡; thus

---

* A diseased state of an organ of sense will perpetually tamper with the understanding, and perhaps at last overthrow it. But when one organ is obliterated, the mind applies some other to a double use. Some ten years back, at Sowerby, I met a man perfectly blind,—from infancy. His chief amusement was *fishing on the wild uneven banks of the Eden,* and up the difficult mountain streams. His friend, a dexterous card-player, also stone-blind, knew every gate and stile of the district. John Gough, of Kendal, *blind,* is not only a mathematician, but an infallible botanist and zoologist; *correcting mistakes of keen sportsmen as to birds and vermin.* His face is all one eye. (*Condensed from Coleridge's Omniana,* p. 332.)

† The eyes of Moyes, although he was totally blind, were not insensible to intense light. Colours were not distinguished by him, but felt. *Red* was disagreeable; he said it was like '*the grating of* '*a saw;*' while *green* was very pleasant, and compared to 'a *smooth* 'surface' when touched.

‡ In some instances blindness seems to have gifted the sufferer with new powers.

A Dr. Guyse, we read, lost his eyesight in the pulpit while he

nearer to our own time, Holman the traveller, to whose labours we have already referred, has made himself a name far beyond the shores of Great Britain. We know not what Saundersons or Hubers the present generation is to see. One name equally great in another path of fame it already has; Prescott, the historian of Ferdinand and Isabella, Mexico and Peru, &c., who, though not blind, has a defect of the eyes which prevents him from reading and writing, but whose literary labours have nevertheless delighted and instructed thousands both in the Old and New World. We are glad also to observe, that Lord Cranborne has come before the world as an author; having written an excellent little 'History of France' for children. We trust that this is but an earnest of what he intends to do for learners of a larger growth.

In the meanwhile it is pleasant to reflect that much more is now being attempted for the blind than has ever yet been accomplished. Asylums and schools are being established in many parts of England; in all which we hope that the tone and extent of education are to rise far above what has yet been done. It argues well for the ground of this hope that a well-organised society is at length in existence, the object of which is to provide a series of standard works for the blind at the smallest possible cost. Schools and asylums may be multiplied throughout the length and breadth of the land to any extent, but if the blind when they leave the school are to go back to the workhouse, the labourer's cottage, the crowded attic of the artisan, or even a workshop of their own, — *without books*, and without the means of procuring them, — their having learned to dare will, after all its cost of toil and time, be but a cause of discontent and repining. We trust, therefore, that all success may attend the labours of *The Society for Printing and Distributing Books for the Use of the Blind*, especially if they print *cheap bibles*.

As it is probable that many of our readers have never visited a school for the blind, we will pay a short visit to the great one in St. George's Fields, probably the largest in the

---

was at prayer before the sermon; but nevertheless managed to preach as usual. An old lady of the congregation hearing him deplore his loss, thus strove to comfort him: — 'God be praised,' said she, 'that 'your sight is gone. I never heard your Reverence preach so power-'ful a service in my life. *I wish for my own part that the Lord had 'taken away your sight twenty years ago; for your ministry would 'have been more useful by twenty degrees.*' The old lady's judicial wish was rather a severe one; but of the correctness of her conclusion we are inclined to doubt.

world. Of the building we will only say that it is large and imposing in appearance. It contains about 150 pupils, both males and females, of very various ages, almost entirely from the indigent class. The object of the school is to teach the blind to read the Bible, and to impart to them such a knowledge of some useful trade as shall enable them if only in part to earn their own living. For this purpose they are usually retained in the school for a period of about six and a half years. All the pupils are totally blind, and yet the majority not only learn to read well, but to write, to cipher, and to spell, besides mastering a trade, or learning to play the organ. We will enter one of the chief work rooms. In it, hard at work, we find upwards of forty boys and men, all totally blind, making basket work of every possible size and description, from the finest and most delicate of dinner mats to the gigantic ark of unpeeled osier for packing swans for a journey across the North Sea. The workers are all cheerful, nay in most cases, merry. Baskets, flower-stands, chairs, and screens, in short, all kinds of wicker work, are here made by the thousand every year. The little boy on the left is a new comer. He is taking a first lesson from the foreman, and learning to split the osiers. In a month from this time he will be able to make a rough market basket. Two months ago he sat moping in a dark corner of a fisherman's cottage in Cornwall, in forlorn helplessness. Since then mind and body have begun to revive, — he is now bright, cheerful, and intelligent, — he can now use his limbs, and begins to find out that he has a mind — aye, and much more — a soul, within him: he has mastered his alphabet, has begun the good habit of saying daily prayers with his companions, and hearing God's word read. His education has commenced, he is learning to think, he is waking up to a new life.*

Look where we will, the work goes busily and deftly on,

---

* The female pupils in this School undergo, we find, a somewhat similar education and training to the boys. A few learn basket-making, &c.; but by far the greater number devote their time to various kinds of sewing, knitting, and netting, spinning twine, making window and picture-frame cord (used at the Royal Castle of Windsor for Her Majesty's pictures), purse-making, and hair-weaving of every possible description. All the household linen in use throughout the School is also made up by the girls and women.

We cannot mention this Institution without connecting with it the name of S. H. Sterry, Esq., of Bermondsey, who throughout a long and well-spent life has laboured most zealously and successfully for the Blind. His labours on their behalf date from the foundation of the school at the beginning of the present century.

as if all the workers had the best of eyes. They sort the osiers, peel them, split them, arrange them for use, if necessary point them, and chip off stray ends of obnoxious twigs with a sharp knife. Enter the shoe shop, and we are impressed with the same conviction, and judging only by the work done we decide at once that the workmen *must* have sharp eyes; hammering, cutting, sewing, going on as cleverly and quickly as among the most clear-sighted set of Crispins. In this room are made shoes for the whole 150 pupils. Enter the mat shop, look at that mountain of mats of all colours, asperities, and sizes; all made by more busy workers whose eyes never saw what their hands so diligently toiled at. The old man near us is busy at an enormous door mat too vast, thick, and solid, it would seem, for any but the sons of Anak. It is for the hall of the Guards' Club in Pall Mall. The boy next to him is fringing his mat with bright green; it is a small neat and dainty affair to be placed inside the study door of dyspeptic Mr. Brown as he reads metaphysics. He is dreadfully afraid of draughts, and this diminutive mat has squared edges, that it may fit exactly into the required space inside his door which leads into the garden. The door opens inwards, but so thin is the mat, that the panel sweeps smoothly over it with ease. Mat-making appears to be hard work, requiring great exertion in beating and combing as the work proceeds, the workman standing during the whole day.

That huge pile on the right is chiefly of coloured rugs, decked with brilliant borders, wreaths of flowers, and patterns of all hues and sizes. It seems impossible that they are the work of the blind. But they can be, and are made in this very shop. The man working at a loom in the corner is making a rug, with a brilliant crimson scroll at either corner on a dark ground. His wools of different colours are given to him by the foreman *in a certain order;* and these he himself arranges by his side, easily within reach, also in a certain order. But how shall he *know* the pattern of the future rug? No possible description, even if the busy foreman could afford time for it, could explain the intricacies of that scroll work. It must be exactly done, too, for it is to match a carpet; every twisted leaf of that rare flower and that curious branch, which grow only in carpet-land, must be accurately copied, or Mr. Brown's critical eye will be offended as he stands in a judicial mood on the border where the land of drugget commences. How then is our rug-maker to follow a pattern he has never seen, in colours of which he has not the faintest notion? Look at him, he is consulting his guide. It is a thin smooth sheet of deal, mathematically divided

by cross-bar lines, scratched into the surface. At certain points of intersection nails are inserted, some deeply, some lightly, others almost buried in the wood, barely catching the eye. The blind weaver is reading them with his finger. They describe to him the pattern his eye never saw, which is now being reproduced for Mr. Cassio Brown. Observe that some nails have large dropsical heads, — others are headless, — a third kind are dying of atrophy,—mere pins; a fourth class wear college caps; and a fifth are but ignominious brads. As his finger follows the line of brads, it is to him as a waved line, circle, or square, it may be of green, or black, or what not, but which ever it be, he feels at once the exact point where the collegians meet their enemies the vulgar brads, and knows, therefore, where to insert the necessary change of colour. Each nail tells its own story, every change of colour, and every new line of march, and this story the blind weaver reads with his fingers' ends.*

Of course it is not every pupil that attains this degree of skill and dexterity. Some never attain it. It is the reward of many years' patient assiduity on the part of teacher and pupil. It is not to be wondered at that comparatively few attain to so great an amount of skill, but that a single blind pupil ever thus masters a weaver's difficult trade. We might easily fill many pages with a further account of the works and ways of blind scholars, and perhaps run the risk of exhausting our readers' patience. Many more famous names † still remain unnoticed,

---

* The detection of colour by the touch of the blind is a mooted point. M. Guillié mentions several anecdotes of blind persons who had the power of discriminating colours by the touch. But, if the testimony of a large body of English blind children can be relied on, the detection of colour is utterly beyond their reach. Saunderson's power of detecting by his *finger* or *tongue*, a counterfeit coin which had deceived the *eye* of a connoisseur, is a totally different question. We are hardly aware how much of our dexterity in the use of the eye arises from incessant practice. Those who have been relieved of blindness at an advanced or even an early period of life, have been often found to recur to the old and more familiar sense of touch, in preference to sight; especially during the first few months after recovering their sight. Coleridge (in his Omniana) mentions a most remarkable instance of a blind man at Hanover, who possessed so keen a touch as to be able to read with his fingers books of *ordinary print*, if printed, as most German books are, on coarse paper. (P. 334.)

† One remarkable instance is given by Dufau at p. 89., with which we have never met before: — 'On cite en Angleterre un parent de 'l'auteur du Roman celèbre de *Tom Jones* (Fielding) qui tout aveugle 'qu'il était, exerçait à Londres les fonctions de *Chief Magistrate of*

though well deserving of note, and replete with interest. From the golden days of 'the blind old man of Scio's rocky isle,' down to our own unpoetic age, when the blind man's song is apt to be redolent of Lucifer matches, and to whine for pity expressed in copper coin, we might easily select many a noble instance of genius, 'cui profundum cæcitas lumen dedit.'

But we think that our present purpose has been fulfilled if we have succeeded in laying before our readers those features in the history and habits of the blind, as a class, wherein chiefly lies the difference between them and the rest of mankind. We have seen what has been done on their behalf, and may now form a fair judgment of what remains to be accomplished. However peculiar and isolated a race they may be, they still have, in common with other men, powers and faculties of mind and body which must be fully recognised and cherished, or every peculiarity will grow more marked, until the isolation has become final and complete.

If the books provided for their use are to be few in number, and those few all of one peculiar cast and tone of thought and subject; if, in short, they are to be dieted on some one dish of mental papulum of unbroken monotony, instead of sharing, at least to some extent, in the lessons of wisdom and beauty to be found elsewhere, it cannot be a matter of surprise that their education should progress but slowly, if it sink not into utter stagnation.

Beyond all doubt the blind man must as he learns to read be taught to prize the book of books above all others. To one in his circumstances it has a special voice and message of hope and comfort. But to institute a comparison between the one book and others, and then to decide that he shall read no single page of amusement or entertainment to the end of his days, appears to be at once an act of injustice and bigotry. The very comparison itself is wanting in that respect which is due to the sacred volume, and on which the decision professes to be founded; while its practical result is thus expressed to the sufferer,—'You have lost the use of your eyes, and are thus in 'a measure cut off from your fellow men, and shut out from 'many sources of pleasure, amusement, and instruction, which 'they enjoy, care shall therefore be taken to cut you off 'entirely from all such sources of enjoyment in the world of 'books.'

---

'*the Police Office* ou de Lieutenant de Police; il avait dans la tête 'ses signalemens de plusieurs milliers de voleurs, et ne se trompait 'jamais lorsqu'on les traduisait devant lui.'

A far juster and wiser decision would, we think, be as follows: 'You have lost your sight, and are thus in a measure 'isolated from the rest of men; as far as possible, therefore, we 'will atone to you for the loss. Instead of shutting up, we 'will open, every available channel of information. Having 'first learned to read and to value the wisest and best of all 'books, you shall have placed within your reach lessons of 'wisdom, truth, and beauty, to be found in other pages.' It is a decision to which the friends of real education must, sooner or later, come.

In proportion as the blind share heartily and thankfully in all that is found to invigorate, to purify, and to instruct the human mind, in that exact ratio will they learn not only to value aright the written Word, but to own Him in whom they live and move. The mental vision will become bright and clear, as the physical blindness is made a lighter burden. The eyes of the soul alone see clearest traces of that great Being to whom the night is as the day. It is true that much has been done for the blind; but much still remains to be done on wider principles, and with more enlarged views. The whole spirit of the age demands that it should be so. Throughout every grade in the social scale is it beginning to be felt, that the life and well being of all is inseparably connected with the welfare of the individual; that the vitality of no one class can be real or lasting, but as it shares in the vitality of the whole. The natural result of this feeling is healthy reaction; new blood is beginning to mingle with the old, and every pulsation gives promise of fresh vigour and renewed life. We agree, indeed, with Prescott in thinking that 'what has already been done has 'conferred a service on the blind, which we, insensible from the 'very prodigality of our blessings, cannot fully estimate. The 'glimmering of the taper which is lost in the blaze of day may 'be sufficient to guide the steps of him whose path lies through 'darkness.' True, a lantern on a dark night is better than no light at all; it may save us from many a stumble, though it cannot save us from an occasional step into miry ways, or perchance from here and there taking a wrong turning. All we ask for the blind is such a share in the advantages, privileges, and enjoyments of the rest of the world as can fairly be given, and really used. Adopting Prescott's simile of the taper, we would say to every friend of the cause in words of an older date,—

'Tu, carusque Deis, et abundans lumine, soli
Ne tibi lumen habe; commune sit omnibus æque.'

ART. III.—1. *A Bill to make better Provision for the Management of Episcopal and Capitular Estates.* (Brought in by the Marquis of Blandford and Captain Kingscote.) London: 1853.

2. *A Bill to amend the Law respecting Simony.* (Brought in by Dr. R. Phillimore and Viscount Goderich.) London: 1853.

THERE probably never was a year in which so many ecclesiastical subjects were brought before the notice of Parliament as in that which has just ended. The Session began in February with the great fight of the Clergy Reserves. It ended in August with the usual 'massacre of the innocents,' wherein the Colonial Church Bill, the Missionary Bishops Bill, and the Episcopal Estates Bill were stifled in a single week. Between these epochs both Houses were repeatedly occupied upon subjects connected with the temporalities of the Church. The law of Patronage was canvassed in two debates on Dr. Phillimore's Simony Bill; Lord Blandford's important measure for the better management of Church Property was several times before the House of Commons; a proposed amendment in the law of Church Rates furnished matter for an interesting discussion, and was supported in an able pamphlet by Lord Stanley; the assessment of Episcopal Revenues was brought before the House of Lords by the Bishop of Salisbury; a Church Building Act was carried through the same House by Lord Harrowby; and a Cathedral Appointments Act was passed by the Government. These numerous measures are a proof that increasing interest is felt by the Legislature in a most important field of legislation. But the growth of knowledge has hardly kept pace with this growth of interest. Even those speakers and writers who aspire to guide public opinion occasionally show, by the extraordinary errors and misstatements into which they are betrayed, a surprising want of practical acquaintance with the most elementary facts relating to their subject. It is with the hope of contributing to the correction of such errors, that we devote the following pages to an examination of some questions in Ecclesiastical Economy which have lately been the theme of frequent argument, both in Parliament and in the Press; and, in connexion with these questions, to the consideration of certain schemes which have been suggested for effecting alterations in the Church Establishment.

In the first place, we may say a few words concerning the actual amount of the Ecclesiastical Revenues. It is strange that there is, as yet, no official document which enables us to state

this with perfect accuracy. With regard to the Parochial Tithes and Glebe, which form the bulk of the property in question, the foundation of our knowledge is the 'Report of the 'Commissioners appointed to inquire into Ecclesiastical Revenues,' presented to Parliament in 1835, which gives the value of all the benefices so far as could be then ascertained. The returns, however, on which this Report was founded, were in some respects incomplete; and many additional benefices have been created since it was published. The best information now accessible on this subject is contained in the annual 'Clergy List,' which gives an alphabetical catalogue of every living in England and Wales, with its annual value (founded mainly on the above-mentioned returns), its population, and the names of its officiating ministers. We have ascertained from this list that the estimated net annual value of the 12,270 benefices in England and Wales is 3,479,460*l.** This sum is divided amongst 17,155 parochial ministers, including 4,885 curates.† The average income of the 12,270 incumbents is 283*l.* per annum.

A trifling addition is made to these funds by *surplice fees* and *Easter offerings*. The former amount to 5*l.* for a population of 1000, and consequently may be estimated at 90,000*l.* for the whole country, which at present contains a population of

---

* In the Clergy List for 1853, the number of benefices whose value is returned is 11,513; the number not returned is 757. The value of those returned is 3,264,260*l.*; and to this we have added a proportional sum for the 757 not returned, which will be 214,600*l.* This gives the total value mentioned in the text. It must be remarked however, that in thus estimating the benefices not returned, we have much exaggerated their value. For 579 out of the 757 are new districts, and proprietary chapels endowed chiefly with pew rents, and yielding an income much below the average. We thus leave a margin more than sufficient to cover any pew rents which may have been omitted in the returns of 1835. We must also observe that the value of all rectories and Vicarages has been reduced, since 1835, by the repeal of the Corn Laws. Thus a tithe-rent charge of the nominal value of 100*l.* (as fixed by the Commutation Act in 1836) only amounted to 91*l.* in 1853, and will be under 90*l.* when this is published in 1854. Hence the total above given is greater than the truth.

† We have ascertained the number of curates by adding together the number licensed in each diocese as given in Whitaker's Ecclesiastical Almanac for 1853. The total number of clergy in England and Wales, according to the Clergy List for 1853, is 18,350. Of these 17,155 would thus appear to be employed in parochial work; the remainder are either dignitaries, schoolmasters, chaplains, or retired from professional duties.

eighteen millions. The *Easter offerings* average 1*l.* for every thousand people, and therefore produce about 18,000*l.* in all.

It must be remembered that the number of benefices and of clergymen here given, is not stationary, but continually increasing. In 1835, according to the Report of the Commissioners *, there were 10,718 benefices in England and Wales; there are now 12,270 †, being an increase of 1,552 in 18 years ‡, or nearly 100 per annum. The annual increase of late has been much more rapid than this. We find that the excess of ordinations over deaths among the clergy has been, during the last few years, about 300 per annum. Part of this increase is due to the additional curates supplied to populous districts by the 'Pastoral Aid' and 'Curates' societies: but it must be mainly referred to the creation of new parochial districts. This is evident, because the total number of curates is now less than it was in 1835, having then been 5,320, according to the Report of the Commissioners. While mentioning this, we cannot but congratulate the Church on the immense improvement indicated by the fact that in 1835 there were more than 4,000 curates of *non-resident* incumbents, and only 1,000 of resident incumbents; whereas there are now only 1,800 curates of *non-residents*, and more than 3,000 curates assisting resident incumbents. It must farther be remarked that the new benefices, while swelling the nominal revenues of the Church, are constantly lessening the average wealth of the clergy, being for the most part provided with the smallest possible endowment.

The above may suffice as a rough estimate of the Parochial Revenues of the Establishment. There remain the Episcopal and Capitular incomes, concerning which the information is

---

* First Report of the Commissioners on Ecclesiastical Revenues, 1835.

† In order to ascertain the number of benefices, and their aggregate value from the Clergy List, it is necessary to add up 245 closely printed pages of figures, a task which took the accountant whom we employed four days. We recommend the publishers of this useful work to give the totals, in future, at the foot of each page.

‡ According to Lord Blandford (speech, p. 29.), the new incumbencies formed under Sir R. Peel's Act, and the Church Building Acts, have amounted only to 1,190. The remainder of the new benefices created since 1835, must (we suppose) have originated in the assignment of parochial districts (under 1 & 2 Will. 4. c. 38.) to new churches, or to chapels previously existing. But perhaps, the number 1,552 given in the text is rather beyond the real increase, because a few proprietary chapels, and a few benefices annexed by statutes to certain superior preferments, were omitted in the list of benefices given in the report of 1835, and are included in the 'Clergy List.'

perhaps more precise, but also more complicated, being derivable from various Reports of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and sundry Parliamentary Returns. It is not necessary however, for our present purpose, to ascertain with precision the actual revenues of the existing bishops and chapters; for these are in a state of transition, some under the old law, some under the new. As our wish is to give an estimate of the permanent financial condition of the Establishment, we may neglect this state of transition, and suppose all these revenues to be upon the system under which, by the operation of the existing law, they will speedily fall. The Episcopal Fund will then be 152,300*l.* (as fixed by an order in council issued in 1853), charged with the maintenance of twenty-seven archbishops and bishops, Sodor and Man not being included. The Capitular Fund may be reckoned at a little under 212,000*l.** when the Act 3 & 4 Vict. c. 113. shall have taken full effect.

From the episcopal and capitular estates will also be obtained, when they are properly managed, a much larger income than they at present yield. This has been already effected to some extent; and Lord Blandford calculates that ultimately a surplus of 445,000*l.* a year, applicable to parochial purposes (including the payment of archdeacons), may be derived from this source. Perhaps this estimate may be too sanguine; but as our wish is not to understate the revenues of the Church, we will take it as correct. Thus we shall have from the estates in question a total income of 809,000*l.*, of which 364,000*l.* will be devoted to the support of bishops and dignitaries, and the remainder to parochial uses. Hence the whole clerical revenues, when they are improved to the utmost possible extent, may amount to 4,397,000*l.* per annum. At present they fall short of this, by about a quarter of a million.

In the ecclesiastical (though not in the clerical) revenues, we must also include the sum raised by church rates, for the maintenance and repair of parochial churches. This amounted (according to a Parliamentary Return) to 506,812*l.* in the year 1839†; since that time there has been no farther return; but the amount is known to have very greatly diminished, by the refusal of rates in many parishes. The final judgment of the

* Of this sum, the charge for deaneries is about 35,000*l.*, for canonries about 90,000*l.*, and the remainder is for minor canonries, choirs, organists, and repairs. But it is not worth while to dwell on details which will so soon be subjected to the revision of Parliament, on the report of the Cathedral Commissioners.

† Strictly speaking, only 363,103*l.* of this was derived from church rates, and the remainder from other sources, *e. g.* local endowments.

House of Lords in the Braintree case, which reverses the decisions of the courts of law whereby the minority was authorised to make a rate, will no doubt reduce still further the funds hitherto derived from this branch of income.

Such are the sources and the amount * of those revenues which have formed the subject of so much recent legislation and discussion.† Concerning their future management, schemes of all kinds have been broached, and opinions of all shades propounded, from those of Messrs. Peto and Miall, who wish to confiscate the funds of the Establishment altogether, to those of Sir R. Inglis, who trembles at the idea of altering the original appropriation of a sixpence. We shall not now enter into the great controversy between the advocates of the general principle of religious endowments, and the adherents of the (so-called) voluntary system. Those who have not been convinced by the reasoning of Dr. Arnold and Dr. Chalmers, are not likely to be moved from their opinion by any new arguments which we could adduce. But all honest ‡ politicians, whichever side they take in this controversy, must agree in the proposition, that it is desirable, so long as ecclesiastical revenues are appropriated to their present purposes, to make them as efficient as possible in promoting the ends to which they are devoted. This proposition has been the basis of nearly all those proposals which have been lately advocated in Parliament. It has been assumed as

* In this amount we have not included pew rents as a separate item, but we have included them in the parochial revenues (see the first note on this Article). It must not be forgotten, however, that they are simply voluntary contributions, and could not be transferred by Parliament; and that their existence is exceptional, and contrary to the theory of our Ecclesiastical Law.

† One of the most moderate and least inaccurate writers against the Establishment, Mr. Allen, who has published a work on 'State 'Churches,' in the present year, reckons the revenues of the Church at *seven millions*, and quotes other estimates which raise them to *nine millions*. To show the extent of Mr. Allen's acquaintance with his subject, it is sufficient to mention that he assumes the value of the glebe not to be included in the Commissioners Report of 1835, and gives a conjectural valuation of it, which he *adds* to the net value of the benefices. The gross misstatements circulated concerning the ecclesiastical revenues show how desirable it is that accurate official returns should be published, as we trust they soon will be.

‡ We say 'honest politicians,' for we cannot apply this epithet to those who avow their wish to keep up all the abuses of the Establishment, and to render it as inefficient for religious ends as possible, in the hope of disgusting the people with the principle of Establishment. This is surely to do evil that good may come.

the object of our Church reformers, to remove from the actual administration of ecclesiastical property every defect which tends to diminish the efficiency, or lower the character of the clergy, and (in the words of Lord Blandford's preamble) to 'render such estates and revenues most productive and bene-'ficial to the Established Church, and most conducive to the 'spiritual welfare of the people.' To effect this end various methods have been recommended. Many measures of practical usefulness have been carried, others have been proposed, and more may be suggested. On the other hand, many mistakes have been committed, many useless nostrums prescribed, many falsehoods too eagerly swallowed by the public. The fundamental fallacy, whence most other errors have sprung, is a belief that the motives of the clergy would be made more pure, and their labours more effectual, by diminishing the wealth of the Establishment, and abolishing what are called (in the phraseology of Mammon) the 'prizes' of the Church. 'A poor and virtuous clergy,' is the watchword of a large and well meaning party of ecclesiastical reformers, who suppose that clerical virtue and clerical poverty go together. We hope that we have in some degree contributed to dispel this delusion, by our recent description of the poorest, but certainly not the most virtuous section of the English hierarchy, the peasant clergy of the mountains. But before we go further, it will be well to say something more as to this excessive wealth attributed to the Church. We have just shown that its total amount is between four and five millions sterling; a sum which, though insignificant when compared with the resources of the country (being less than the produce of the income tax of 7*d.* in the pound on the wealthy classes) is yet in itself a considerable revenue. But when we remember the numbers among whom it is divided, and that the average share of each is less than 300*l.* per annum, it cannot be considered a very exorbitant remuneration for the services of educated men; and we can scarcely agree with the 'Times' that 'the vast wealth of our Church is, in one sense, its greatest 'misfortune.'* The emoluments of the parochial clergy, at all events, will not excite the envy of any well-paid bagman. It is true, that some of them have more than the above average dividend; and the 'Times' tells us with horror that 'the world 'hears of livings of 1000*l.* a year!'† But the shock which our minds receive at first hearing of an income so enormous as this, may perhaps be diminished by a little investigation. Let us take the case mentioned by the 'Times' of one of these le-

* 'Times,' June 22. 1853. † Ibid.

viathans of clerical opulence. Let us examine the actual receipts of a rector who scandalises the world by pocketing 1000*l.* per annum from the Church. In the first place, the repeal of the Corn Laws has caused a fall of 10 per cent. in the tithe-rent-charge, so that a tithe-owner endowed with 1000*l.* a year of rent-charge now only receives 900*l.* This reduction, notwithstanding the present high range of prices, may not have yet reached its maximum; but we will confine ourselves to the present state of things, and suppose our wealthy incumbent still to possess a clerical income of 900*l.* a year. From this are to be deducted the poor rates, amounting to 130*l.* per annum, the way rates, amounting to 15*l.*, and the expenses of collection (at 3 per cent.), amounting to 30*l.** Moreover his parish being large (as it must be to yield so much tithe), he will generally be obliged to keep an assistant curate. In fact, we find from the Clergy List that for every three livings of 1000*l.* per annum, four curates are kept. Hence if we suppose only one required, we are below the average. This involves a further charge of 100*l.* a year upon his income. The above deductions bring down the rector's nominal 1000*l.* a year to an actual 625*l.* We must remember also that these charges on professional income fall upon the clergy alone. For example, the brother of our rector is judge of a county court, who has the same nominal income as the clergyman, viz. 1000*l.* per annum. But upon that income no rates are charged, and out of it he pays nothing for assistants. If there be more work in his district than one judge can do, two are appointed, and the salary of the second is not substracted from the salary of the first. It is true, on the other hand, that the barrister has to pay house-rent, while the rector has only to keep his parsonage in repair. We may put this as a disadvantage against the barrister of 50*l.* per annum. Thus, while the net income of the rector is 625*l.*, that of the barrister will be 950*l.*, although their nominal incomes (and their income tax) are the same. But the difference is in reality still greater than this. For the whole charities of an extensive parish require from the wealthy rector a liberal support. He must subscribe to the parochial friendly societies, to the lying-in-charity, to the coal charity, to the clothing club, to the choristers, to the bell-ringers. He must maintain the national school (at an expense of 20*l.* or 30*l.* at the least) and must give largely to the relief of all the casual distress

* The deductions here given are those actually paid upon a tithe-rent charge of 1000*l.* in a case with which we are acquainted. The charge for poor rates is taken on the average of the last seven years.

and permanent poverty by which he is surrounded. Besides this there are innumerable claims upon his purse, from institutions and societies for the promotion of various benevolent and religious objects, local, provincial, diocesan, and metropolitan. He must subscribe to the county hospital, the diocesan training school, the Christian Knowledge Society, the Missionary Society, and the National School Society. Besides these necessary things, there will be voluntary offerings expected from him, dependent on his theological party; if he is a Low Churchman, he must contribute for the conversion of the Jews; if a Tractarian, for the conversion of the archbishop. Meanwhile we had almost forgotten that Mr. Christopher Hodgson will summon him annually to pay the *tenths* of his benefice to Queen Anne's Bounty Office; and that he will also be compelled to excuse several of his poorer parishioners from the payment of their tithes. If he be a man of average liberality, these various claims will subtract at the least another 100*l.* a year from his income. Meanwhile his legal brother discharges his conscience and more than satisfies all expectations, by the disbursement of 10*l.* per annum in charitable donations. Thus our fortunate incumbent will have about 525*l.* of net income, out of which he must pay 29*l.* (the income tax on 1000*l.*) to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and congratulate himself that he has still nearly 500*l.* remaining for the maintenance of his household and the education of his family.

Such is an accurate account of the professional receipts of the wealthiest among the parochial clergy. But, to appreciate 'the vast wealth of our Church' as it deserves, it must be remembered that there are only 174 livings which amount to 1000*l.* a year; that there are only a thousand which amount to 500*l.* a year; and that out of the whole number of 12,270 benefices, more than 8000 are below 300*l.* a year. Hence two-thirds of the parochial incumbents receive less than 300*l.* per annum from their profession, and out of this they are often compelled, by the large population of their parishes, to maintain an assistant; and below these there are nearly 5000 curates, whose salary does not average above 100*l.* a year. If the clergy are not actually sunk in such poverty as this, it is because they possess, in most cases, a private fortune equal in amount to their professional income, and often far exceeding it.

But some will say that if the parochial clergy are too poor, the dignitaries of the Church are too rich; and that bishops, deans, and canons absorb the revenues which ought to be distributed among their more needy brethren. To this we may reply, in the first place, that the abolition of all these dignities

would only put an additional 360,000*l.* a year at our disposal; and that, supposing this sum divided among the 13,000 * clergy (incumbents and curates) whose income is below 300*l.*, it would only give each of them 27*l.* a year more than he has at present; an addition which would make no appreciable difference in their position. But again, we deny that the dignities of the Church are unreasonably endowed, as compared with the highest posts in other professions. The 28 † bishops and archbishops have incomes (under the new system) of about 5000*l.* each. Now there are 22 judges in the Courts of Chancery, Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer, with average salaries of about 6000*l.* Moreover the number of barristers (as appears from the Law List of 1853) is below 4000; whereas the number of clergy is above 18,000. So that while more than 4 barristers in 1000 are elevated to the Bench, scarcely more than one clergyman in 1000 attains the mitre. At present the Church and Bar are recruited from the same classes of society, by men who are subjected to the same education, and pass through school and college side by side. We do not see why we should grudge to the heads of one profession the position which no one grudges to the heads of the other.‡ But if the episcopal incomes are not unreasonably large, still less can the secondary dignities, the deaneries and canonries, be thought too highly endowed. The income of the deaneries is fixed for the future at an average of 1000*l.* each.§ Under these are 4 canonries in each cathedral, averaging at present 600*l.* each. Besides these are 70 archdeacons, 8 of whom hold canonries, and the rest receive on the average only 150*l.* each. Compare these emoluments with those of masters in Chancery, bankruptcy commissioners, county court judges, and police magistrates, and we shall again find that the Bar has a great advantage, even in nominal emoluments, over the Church.

But to this it may be replied, that the prizes of the Bar are always given, if not to the worthiest, at any rate to the worthy; and that it is scarcely possible to bestow such patronage on a

---

* Besides the 4,885 curates, there are 8,230 incumbents receiving less than 300*l.* a year; which makes 13,115 in all with less than 300*l.* a year.

† Including Sodor and Man.

‡ If we compare another profession of similar education, that of Physic, we find (from Dr. Hope's statement in his Life) that a London physician in good second-rate practice makes 4000*l.* a year. The heads of the profession make much more.

§ By 3 & 4 Vict. c. 113. Four deaneries are to have more than this, but six or seven others have at present less.

barrister totally incompetent; while, on the other hand, the high places of the Church have been too often filled by men who had no claim whatever except political connexion or personal servility. We must acknowledge the truth of this charge as applying to the past; and it fully accounts for the difference of feeling with which the dignities of the two professions are regarded by the public. But it should be remembered that if Church appointments have been bad, it is the fault of the advisers of the Crown, and therefore the fault of the Parliament and of the nation, which has regarded such appointments not with indignation but with apathy. A better spirit is now aroused, and the appointments made during the last ten years have been, for the most part, highly creditable. There is every reason to hope that the improved tone of public opinion will continue to enlighten the conscience of cabinet ministers, and to purify the fountains of preferment.

But though it be granted that the dignities of the Church are not excessive either in number or in wealth, considered as the prizes of a secular profession, still it may be argued that the existence of such prizes interferes with the spiritual interests of the Church. It is well (it may be said) that the labours of the barrister, the soldier, or the physician should be animated by the hopes of wealth and the aspirations of ambition; but the minister of religion should need no such earthly stimulants to rouse his sense of duty, and his zeal should be kindled at a holier altar than that of Mammon. We entirely sympathise in these sentiments, and freely acknowledge that if the abolition of the high offices of the Church would purify the motives of her ministers, or if, as a general rule, they were induced to enter their profession by the hope of rank and wealth, we should gladly instal Messrs. Bright and Horsman as Ecclesiastical Commissioners, with full powers to abate the redundant opulence of the hierarchy. But, if we examine the facts, we shall find that the supposed motives do not really influence the clergy to any appreciable extent. Much misapprehension has been caused on this subject by one of the cleverest of Sydney Smith's writings, his inimitable 'Letters to Archdeacon Sin-'gleton.' This, like all his works, combines sparkling wit with clear-headed common sense; but the latter quality sometimes overleaps itself, and intrudes into regions where shrewdness is not the supreme arbiter of truth. For too much knowledge of the world may sometimes as far mislead a man as too little; the motives of the simple may be hidden from the crafty by their very craft; as a lighted candle in a man's hand will blind him to the stars in the heavens. Thus when Sydney

Smith gauges the motives of eighteen thousand country clergymen by the standard measure which he would apply to three or four hundred London barristers, his knowledge of the world does not save him from showing an ignorance of human nature. He starts with an assumption that the clergy are induced to take Orders by the hope of gaining high preferment. They are all competitors in a game of chance, where the blanks are curacies and the prize a mitre. 'The whole income of the 'Church,' he says, 'if equally divided, would be about 250*l.* for 'each minister. Who would go into the Church, and spend '1200*l.* or 1500*l.* on his education, if such were the highest 'remuneration he could ever look to? At present men are 'tempted into the Church by the prizes of the Church.'* And he compares this to the case of the Bar, where 'each 'man hopes to be a Scarlett or a Brougham, and takes out his 'ticket in a lottery where the mass must infallibly lose, trusting 'to his good fortune, and believing that the prize is reserved 'for him, disappointment for others. So it is with the 'Clergy.'† And again he says: 'By the old plan of paying by 'lottery, not only do you obtain a parochial clergy upon much 'cheaper terms, but from the gambling propensities of human 'nature, and the irresistible tendency to hope that they shall 'gain the great prizes, you tempt men into your service who 'keep up their credit and yours not by your allowance, but by 'their own capital.' * * * 'If I was writing in gala and 'parade, I would not hold this language; but we are in earnest, 'and on business. * * * We must get down at once to the 'solid rock, without heeding how we disturb the turf and the 'flowers above.'‡ Thus it appears that the 'solid rock' on which the Church is founded, is the love of money, which has erroneously been called *the root of all evil.* This is surely the most original of all the manifold interpretations of that controverted text, *Super hanc petram ædificabo ecclesiam meam.*

Now, we freely own that if this were a true representation of the Establishment, we should be exceedingly inclined to echo the battle-cry of Dissent, 'Down with her, down with her, even 'unto the ground.' But it requires only a slight acquaintance with the ordinary specimens of clerical humanity, to show that Sydney Smith's view is founded only on exceptional instances. We must, indeed, take his word for it, that he was himself actuated by the motives which he describes; and we may acknowledge that a certain number of able and ambitious men,

* First Letter to Singleton.
† Ibid.
‡ Third Letter to Singleton.

in every generation, are brought into the ministry of the Church by similar calculations. But this number is very small, in comparison with those who are attracted by influences wholly different. The prizes in a lottery can excite the hopes of those only who have taken the tickets; and the ticket-holders in Smith's ecclesiastical lottery must necessarily be few. In other words, the great majority of clergymen are ordained with the full knowledge that they cannot by possibility obtain any of the higher dignities. These prizes, so far as they are 'open 'to competition' at all, are open only to those who are qualified to compete for them by literary distinction, or by aristocratic connexion. Men who possess either of these qualifications, may be suspected of entering the Church for the sake of its deaneries and bishoprics. But how many are these, out of the 18,000 clergymen of England? If we said that one in twenty thought himself possessed of such claims, that he would be disappointed if he passed through life without gaining an ecclesiastical dignity, we should greatly exaggerate the number. We cannot doubt, if we look at facts, that the great mass of the existing clergy entered upon their profession with a full knowledge of their prospects. They originally expected and calculated on that lot which they have subsequently obtained.

No doubt, however, Sydney Smith is right in his assertion, that the actual income derived by the majority of clergymen from their profession, is a motive quite inadequate to explain their adopting such a line of life. He says, truly, that the money spent on their education might have been more profitably invested in trade. And he farther calls attention to the remarkable fact (which he was the first to point out,) that the average private fortune of the clergy exceeds their professional income. He takes seven clergymen promiscuously, in his own neighbourhood, and finds that the aggregate of their permanent income, from private sources, amounts to about the same as the aggregate of their clerical income from church preferment. We have ourselves made a similar estimate, and found that in twelve adjacent parishes, the total ecclesiastical income of the incumbents was 4,200*l.*, and the total private income 6,400*l.* And we believe, that it would be found generally, that Sydney Smith's calculation underrates the usual proportion of a clergyman's private to his professional resources. In order to form a rough estimate of the real circumstances of the case, let any one look round his neighbourhood, and observe how few of the clergy can be considered as living at the rate of less than 500*l.* a-year. Yet such an expenditure would (as we have seen) be about double the average professional income of a clergyman.

Thus the clergy, while poor as a profession, are rich as a class; a fact, which goes far to account for the popular notions of 'the 'vast wealth of the Church.' The advantages derived from this state of things are obvious to all men. We see them, wherever we go, in ruined parsonages rebuilt, new churches raised, and old churches restored, school-rooms erected and endowed, and rich and poor knit together by ties of kindness, which exemplify 'the mutual help and comfort which the one ought 'to have of the other.' Sydney Smith declares, that the wealth of these capitalists is attracted into the service of the Church on the 'lottery' principle, by 'the gambling propensities of 'human nature, and the irresistible tendency to hope that they 'will gain the great prizes.' But this is a palpable mistake; for the clergymen of private fortune are the very men who have (as a general rule) neither expectation nor wish for 'the 'great prizes;' and the real competitors for these rewards, the literary men, the controversialists, and the partisans, have usually little or no private fortune.

But if we reject this 'gambling' theory, we are bound to assign some other and more probable motives, which may explain the fact that so large a number of men annually devote themselves to a profession so ill remunerated. Nor shall we attempt to maintain that the great mass of the clergy adopt their calling from motives of heroic self-sacrifice. Those who are ordained in the spirit of apostles are necessarily few, because human nature does not produce heroes or saints in crops; such visitants come to us 'not in battalions, but as single spies.' A modern infidel writer, who cannot be suspected of exaggeration in favour of the Church, estimates these apostolic clergymen as 'one in fifty;' and says that, rare as they are, yet their life exhibits a self-devotion so noble, 'that they are not only enough 'for the salt of their class, but for the salt of the world too.'* In the next degree to these, we may reckon no inconsiderable number who have sought in the service of religion a remedy for the sorrows of life. They hope to sweeten the bitterness of their lot, by giving themselves wholly to the duties of benevolence and devotion. To preach glad tidings to the poor, to heal the broken-hearted, to shed light upon the darkness of the dying, seems to them the happiest destiny for a wounded spirit. Their imagination responds to the words of the clerical poet, who sings the soothing influence of ministerial duties: —

'The herbs we seek to heal our woe
Familiar by our pathway grow,
Our common air is balm.'

* Froude's Nemesis, p. 7.

Others again there are of shrinking and sensitive natures, who seek refuge in a sacred calling from the unsatisfying turmoil and hard-hearted selfishness of the world. They yield to the same impulse which drove so many of kindred disposition from the rough struggle of mediæval life into the shelter of the cloister. They imagine that they can escape from the strife of tongues by flying to the altar of God; though they often find, too late, that where they fled for peace they have rushed into a battle-field. More numerous than any of these classes are those who enter the profession because their unambitious temper finds in it an appropriate sphere for the exercise of moderate talent and ordinary energies. If they are animated by no vocation to a life of apostolic labour, yet they intend to do their duty to the flock which shall be committed to their charge. Without renouncing the prospect of happiness for themselves, they think also of contributing to the happiness of others. They indulge, it may be,

> 'In moonlight dreams
> Of love and home by mazy streams;'

visions of the 'domus et placens uxor;' of the snug parsonage and cheerful fireside; of smooth lawns and trelliced roses, mingle in their ideal of the future. But with such fancies are blended less selfish pictures of new school-buildings filled with peasant children; of shivering paupers clothed and comforted; of cottages made glad with Christmas dinners; of wine and oil poured into the wounds of poverty. Such candidates for ordination look forward to a routine of kindly and useful, if not laborious duties, with a respectable position in society, and a small addition to their private fortune. Many of them, moreover, being themselves the sons of clergymen, have the additional inducement of habitual association and hereditary connexion to tempt them into the profession of their fathers.

Such are the motives which, acting either separately or in combination, and often mingled in undistinguishable proportions one with another, impel so many thousands of educated men into the ministry of the Church. And if these fall short, as no doubt they do, of the ideal standard of Christian zeal, and of that necessity to preach the Gospel which was laid upon a Paul or a Bernard, yet we must remember that it is the wisdom of those who establish or maintain national institutions, to avail themselves of the ordinary laws of human nature, not to look for exceptional manifestations. The utmost which the State can demand of its officers is not a life of heroism, but a life of usefulness.

But though we deny that the clergy generally are influenced

by motives so low and selfish as those ascribed to them by Sydney Smith, we admit that there is a small minority actuated, if not by the 'gambling' spirit which he advocates, yet by views equally secular, and calculations even more definitely sordid. To this minority belong not only some active and ambitious men, who possessing ability sufficient to make themselves valuable in any profession, are called to the Church in the same spirit in which they would be called to the Bar; but many of an inferior class, whose aim is to rise without any merit at all, and whom the world designates as *clerical adventurers*. First and most conspicuous is the *Irish Fortune-hunter*, who after getting ordained in Tipperary, and serving his two years as curate among his native bogs, impatiently rushes across the Channel to seek his destined prey. He promptly advertises in the 'Record' for a 'town sphere of usefulness,' and is at length appointed assistant to the minister of a chapel in some wealthy borough, the seat of manufactures or commerce. If his face and figure aid the fascinations of his tongue, he soon wins the idolatry of his fairer hearers, and ends by marrying the richest widow in his congregation. Next we have the *Creeping Climber*, who begins life as a servitor at Oxford, with a firm determination to die a bishop; and by dint of tuft-hunting and time-serving, succeeds in crawling slowly but surely, if not to the pinnacle of the temple, at least to a snug harbour among its battlements. Then there is the *Renegade Dissenter*, perhaps the most offensive specimen of this offensive class. He is the son of a small tradesman in a country town, and being a clever lad, is patronised by the independent minister, and educated by assistance from a non-conformist charity fund. In due time he becomes himself a dissenting preacher, and saves enough out of the small gains of his profession to pay for his academical course at St. Bees. Thus qualified, he renounces his hereditary faith, takes orders in the Church, becomes hyper-orthodox in his opinions, and cuts his father who adheres to their patrimonial creed. He of course distinguishes himself by extreme violence against the sectarians whom he has deserted, and publishes tracts against schism, and dialogues defensive of the Establishment. Thus perhaps he commends himself to the notice of some weak and well-intentioned patron; and obtains the wages of apostacy in the shape of a paltry benefice and a trifling rise in social rank. Finally there is the *Society's Agent*, who spends his life in a perpetual tour, speechifying every day at some new place, and dining afterwards upon venison and claret with the chairman of the meeting. When he has employed five years in this way, he must have formed so large an acquaintance with influential people,

that it is strange if none of them is induced to provide for so good a man; especially as they are not likely to know that he has been thrice insolvent, and has ruined a whole army of small tradesmen who served him in the curacies where he ministered before commencing his itinerant career.*

We do not shrink from painting these consecrated speculators in their true colours, nor from acknowledging that they deserve all the reprobation which is poured upon them by the enemies of the Church. But we must remember that they are by no means the peculiar product of a dignified Establishment. They are incidental to every method of providing for the ministration of public worship and its functionaries, and are at least as common a fruit of the 'voluntary principle' as of State endowment. Any one who doubts this has only to examine into the working of the unendowed system in the United States of America. Indeed, there needs but little knowledge of human nature to convince us that, so long as there are ministers of religion at all, there must be some mercenary ministers. Even among the Presbyters converted by St. Paul and ordained by Timothy, there were those who made a gain of godliness.

The only peculiar product of an opulent State Church is the *Safe Man*, who if a species of the mercenary genus at all, is its least disgusting and most decorous type. He is usually distinguished in early life by academical success, which forms the appropriate basis of his subsequent career. When he has entered on the business of maturer years, he seldom ventures upon the dangerous experiment of authorship; or, if he choose that mode of launching himself upon the notice of the world, he commits himself to nothing by his publication; but edits a 'Father' without controversial notes, or publishes a volume of sermons, polished in style, and neutral in sentiment. He carefully shuns the violence of partisanship, and shrinks with horror from extreme opinions, aspiring above all things to the character of a sound and moderate divine. Thus he steadily rises in reputation, and the general favour which he attracts, advances him in due time to an archdeaconry, a professorship, a London rectory, a college headship, or some other ecclesiastical stepping stone. In the execution of his office he is regulated by the old monastic rule 'Bene loqui de superioribus, fungi officio taliter qualiter,

* We ought to state that we by no means intend this for a description of agents of religious societies in general. Most of them are worthy men, some of them are eminently excellent; but we are here speaking of exceptional cases, and some of these agents are the vilest of the vile.

'et sinere mundum ire sicut vult mundus ire.' He does his duty in the way which best falls in with the standard of opinion in his time; and therefore, in the present time, he will do it well, but not too well. He never originates a reform in any established institution; yet he has no superstitious dislike of innovation, and if he sees that a change must come, he is quite willing 'to swell the triumph and partake the gale.' He never wilfully makes an enemy; and if as he rises, he finds it absolutely needful to drop a friend, he does it with decency; not cutting his earlier connexions, like the vulgar climber, but gradually loosening their hold upon him, and letting them slip down the stream, so that he seems rather deserted by them than deserting them; for in all his actions he is distinguished by a sense of the plausible and becoming. He marries, as he preaches, prudently; and in the whole of his well ordered life (though his prosperity may attract the assaults of envy) there is no point on which calumny can effectually fasten. At last his virtue is rewarded by the highest honours of his profession; and when the expected mitre descends upon his head, every one acknowledges that it would have been impossible for the Premier to make a 'safer' appointment. He carries his ruling principle with him to the Bench, and whether charging or speaking, preaching or voting, he is the 'safest' bishop in the House of Lords,—'His armis illâ quoque *tutus* in aulâ.' It is the grand aim of his episcopate that no man of any party may say that he would be 'dangerous' at Lambeth. If he provides for his family by his patronage, it is moderately and discreetly; from flagrant jobbery he is restrained, not merely by the fear of public censure but by gentlemanly feeling; for with all his foibles, he is still a gentleman. When at length he is laid beside his predecessors beneath the altar of his cathedral, all men must confess that his career, if it has conferred no splendid benefits on his country, has at least been serenely soothing and tranquillising to the Church. If he has done harm, it is by the omission of good, not by the perpetration of mischief.

By the abolition of the prizes of the Church, we might (it is true) eliminate the class which we have just described. The *safe man* would become an extinct variety of the clerical genus. But his place in the creation would be supplied by a degraded type. Fortune hunters of the lower and baser kinds would swarm into existence, who would add vulgarity to worldliness, and servility to ambition. On the other hand, by such a revolutionary proceeding, the nation would lose many advantages inseparably connected with the present system.

In the first place, if the bishoprics were reduced to an apos-

tolic poverty, and deprived of their temporal rank and influence, the bishops would be tempted to make up for this diminution of their importance by lofty claims of sacerdotal power. We see this result in Scotland, where nearly all the bishops are Tractarians. And even in America, notwithstanding the power of the laity in the Episcopal Church, and the anti-sacerdotal tendencies of the democratic spirit, many of the bishops have embraced the same opinions, and one of them has ended by joining the Church of Rome.

A different but not less serious evil would result from the suppression of cathedral dignities, which is a still more favourite project with many of our Church reformers than even the abasement of Prelacy. In this, as in most other cases, the thing needed is not demolition but reconstruction. The cathedrals, it must be admitted, have not hitherto been so useful as they might have been; but considered in their design and their capabilities, they are essential parts of a well-organised Establishment. It is a sufficient refutation of their wholesale denouncers to quote the judgment of Dr. Chalmers, given during the last year of his life before a Committee of the House of Commons, in the following words:—'To such a degree am I in favour of ecclesiastical 'sinecures, that I should be glad to have them in our own [the 'Free] Church.' * * * * 'There should be a certain number 'of persons of learning, maintained at leisure and endowed, for 'the purpose of contributing to theological literature.' In the same passage he calls the alienation of cathedral property to parochial purposes 'a vulgarising process.'* Such was the opinion of a man who was above all men most exempt from the temptation of exaggerating the usefulness of cathedral as compared with parochial endowments, since his whole life was spent in developing the powers of the parochial system, and since he held the parochial ministry to be the one essential function of a Church.

But the worst mischief to be feared from erasing the inequalities of the Establishment by a levelling process, would be the effect of such a measure in repelling from the Church a large proportion of those classes from which she now derives her most serviceable recruits. We have seen how many of the clergy bring into their profession a larger income than they derive from it; and we have endeavoured to show that Sydney Smith was mistaken in his assertion that they were allured by the attraction which the 'prizes of the Church' held out to 'the gambling pro-'pensities of their nature.' Nevertheless we believe him to be

* Life of Chalmers, vol. iv. p. 600.

right in supposing that if these prizes were removed, the great majority of such men would be repelled. For if the outward *prestige* and splendour of the Establishment were thus destroyed, it would soon lose the reputation of being a 'gentlemanly' profession, which it now enjoys; it would sink to the condition of the Presbyterian Kirk in Scotland, a body which is recruited almost exclusively from the lower ranks of society, and which consequently does not exercise that influence over the higher and more educated classes which ought to belong to a national establishment. The increase of the social rank and influence of the English clergy in the last hundred years is a very curious phenomenon, and its causes have not hitherto been satisfactorily explained. Mr. Macaulay, it is true, has shown that at the time of the Revolution the extreme poverty of the benefices accounts for the low standing of the parochial clergy; that poverty preventing them, under the circumstances of the time, from obtaining a decent education. And we lately endeavoured to illustrate his view, by showing that the actual condition of the Mountain clergy, whose circumstances approach most nearly to those which then existed, still presents the same features which he describes.* But it would be a great mistake to infer from this that the increased value of ecclesiastical property accounts for the immense change in the position of the clergy. The cause is quite disproportionate to the effect. It is true that the value of the tithe has increased in a more rapid proportion than that of the rent, so that where the income of the parson would have been a twentieth of the income of the squire in Charles the Second's time, it is now a twelfth of it. But it is still not such, in nine cases out of ten, as to secure the services of a gentleman. This is evident when we recollect that (not to mention the 5000 curates) the income of 8000 incumbents is below 300*l.* a year, that is, below the ordinary salary of a banker's clerk. Nor again is it any explanation of the phenomenon in question to say that it results from the improvement of the clergy in refinement and intelligence; for this very improvement depends in great measure on the wealth of those classes from which the Church is recruited; inasmuch as the preliminary training at public school and university is a very expensive luxury, as many fathers can testify. The real cause which has poured so many recruits of higher standing into the ranks of the clergy, is to be found in the great increase (if it should not be rather called the creation) of a class which scarcely existed two hundred years ago, the *upper-middle* class of English society. If we travel from

* See article on "Church in the Mountains," No. 198.

London, or any other great town, into the country, we pass hundreds upon hundreds of houses whose look tells us that they must be occupied by families with incomes ranging from 500*l.* to 1500*l.* a year.* As the wealth of England has grown, these households have become more numerous, year by year; and with the growth of civilisation and intelligence, their wealth has enabled them to procure a better and better education. The sons of such families now form the majority of the English clergy. The motives which lead these men into orders we have already endeavoured to explain. And it is easy to see the causes which would neutralise these motives if the revolutionary proposals which we are discussing were carried into effect. Those among them who are urged to the work of evangelists by apostolic zeal, would still embrace the sacred calling; but the greater part would probably shrink from a profession which would then be stigmatised as plebeian by the vulgar rich; and, at all events, their parents and guardians would discourage them from entering it. Every one whose acquaintance extends beyond the Tweed is aware how reluctantly a Scotch country gentleman would see his son become a Presbyterian minister. It would be difficult to exaggerate the injury inflicted on the State, by the repulsion of the most educated and influential clergy from the Church.

In exchange for this public loss, the gain sought by the advocates of ecclesiastical equality is the improvement of small livings and the relief of indigent curates. We have already shown that, by confiscating the episcopal and capitular revenues, they might raise the income of those clergy who have less than 300*l.* a year by 27*l.* apiece. We suppose that every one would admit the uselessness of such a paltry augmentation. But perhaps there may be some who would prefer to leave the poor incumbents in their poverty, and bestow the fruits of confiscation upon the still poorer curates. They may urge that 360,000*l.* divided among the 4885 curates would give above 70*l.* to each. And they might justly consider it worth an effort to raise the remuneration of these labourers from 100*l.* to 170*l.* per annum, on the assumption that they are doomed to continue for life in their present post. So strange is the ignorance prevalent on ecclesiastical subjects, that there are doubtless many who believe this to be the case. In popular works of amusement (Mr. Dickens's Household Words is an example) we find it often assumed that curates are a race of clerical helots,

* The returns to the Income Tax furnish a more exact mode of ascertaining the great and increasing numbers of this class.

who never rise, except by some wonderful stroke of fortune, to the condition of their masters. A recent article in 'The Times' confirms this impression as follows: 'It is by the 'merest chance in the world that a curate is ever anything else 'than a curate, or that he ever receives more than the highest 'prize of his class, a house and 120*l.* a year.'* It would be exactly as true to say 'it is by the merest chance in the world 'that a midshipman is ever anything else than a midshipman.' The cases are precisely parallel. Every vicar and rector, canon, dean, and bishop in the Church, was originally a curate, unless he happened to be fellow of a college when he was ordained. Either a curacy or a fellowship is a necessary prerequisite to ordination, for no one can be ordained at once to a benefice. It is true that there are men to be found who never rise beyond a curacy; as there are grey-headed midshipmen occasionally to be seen in the navy. But the former case is quite as rare as the latter; promotion is the rule, non-promotion the exception, in both professions. Out of the 4885 curates now in England, we much doubt whether there are 400 to be found above the age of fifty; and of these, some are men of fortune who remain curates from choice; and nine in ten of the remainder are kept down by their own demerit. The aged and exemplary clergyman, starving on a miserable stipend with a sickly wife and ten hungry children, though common in fiction is a rarity in fact. No doubt there are starving curates to be found, but they are the victims of their own imprudence. If a man with an income of 100*l.* a year, whether he be curate, ensign, or midshipman, chooses to marry at twenty-five, and to have ten children by thirty-five, he cannot expect to live in affluence, or to bring up his family in comfort. And the same imprudence and want of principle which has brought him into this condition will probably render him inefficient in his profession, and unlikely to deserve preferment. So far from curates forming a separate 'class' (as 'The Times' calls them), they share in all the interests and opinions, sympathies and prejudices, of their beneficed brethren. We have no doubt that Sydney Smith is perfectly correct when he says that 'if you were to gather a parliament of curates, on 'the hottest Sunday in the year, after all the services, sermons, 'burials, and baptisms of the day were over, and to offer them 'such increase of salary as would be produced by the confiscation 'of the cathedral property, they would reject the measure.'†

* 'Times,' June 22. 1853.

† We read this sentence of Sydney Smith's the other day to a

But does not the existence of these rich prizes in the Church encourage an avaricious spirit in the clergy? The best answer to this question is another: Are the clergy, taken as a body, distinguished for avarice? We suppose the universal answer would be, that they are generally remarkable for qualities the reverse of this — for ignorance of the world, unbusiness-like habits, and liability to imposition. Faults and follies they have in abundance; bigotry, prejudice, and narrowness of mind, have been clerical failings from time immemorial; but no one can justly accuse them of grasping rapacity. On this point we might call in the evidence of the London beggars, who are attracted to every man in a black coat and white neckcloth, by an instinctive knowledge that he belongs to a class which they have the right to victimise. Or, again, we might quote the testimony of her Majesty's School Inspectors to the fact that if the poor in the country districts are educated at all, it is mainly at the expense of the clergyman. But a more general and striking proof has lately been given of the pecuniary disinterestedness of this profession. In the year 1836, the income of the parochial clergy was commuted into a rent-charge, which was fixed for ever at the same number of bushels of corn. Within ten years occurred the repeal of the corn laws. By the combined effect of both measures, the income of the clergy was inevitably reduced, without the possibility of any compensation, such as they might have had under the old law, from the effects of improved cultivation. Mr. Cobden, in a letter to a clergyman, published (if we remember rightly) in 1848, stated that *he had always said that the clergy would be the only ultimate losers by the repeal of the corn laws;* but advised them nevertheless not to oppose a measure so beneficial to their fellow countrymen *for the sake of increasing their own luxuries.* This advice was substantially wise and right. Before he gave it, however, the clergy had already adopted the disinterested course which he recommended; for neither before nor since the repeal of the corn laws was there any clerical agitation, nor a single clerical petition, against the measure. We do not believe that any other class would have borne so quietly a change which so largely mulcted their professional income.

But it may be said that, although the general body of the clergy is free from the imputation of avarice, yet the holders of the great dignities and lordly sees are led astray by the deceit-

---

gentleman who has remained a curate for the unusually long period of ten years. 'Reject it!' he exclaimed, 'to be sure we should, by 'ninety-nine voices out of a hundred.'

fulness of riches. And the ruthless onslaught lately made upon two of the bishops, for alleged misappropriation of Church funds, by the chief organ of the press, has tended to fix this opinion in the public mind. We may admit that no method could have been devised more certain to lead to injurious consequences than that adopted by Parliament in 1836* (now happily abandoned) for the regulation of episcopal incomes. It was intended that the bishops should receive a certain salary, and it was enacted that they should pay over a fixed sum (the supposed surplus of their revenue over that intended income) to the Ecclesiastical Commission. The Commissioners underrated the value of the sees of Durham and Salisbury, and assessed them at so low a payment that the two bishops have received an income much larger than Parliament had intended. But this assessment, once made, could not (until the recent change in the law) be legally altered in the lifetime of the respective bishops. The surplus, though erroneously given them, was their legal property. The charge against them is that they did not at once hand over this surplus to the Commissioners. But it must be remembered that their income was fluctuating, and that they knew not whether the surplus of one year might not be cancelled by the deficit of the next. It might well have happened (as it did in Egypt) that seven fat years should be swallowed up by seven lean. We may wish, indeed, that when experience showed a continued surplus, these prelates had presented it to the public, instead of spending it (as they did) upon the charities of their own dioceses. But it is a calumnious exaggeration to say, as their assailants have said, that because they failed to show this degree of liberality, they were guilty of conduct 'which would exclude a 'merchant from the Stock Exchange.'† We admit, however, that the former method of fixing the episcopal incomes produced bad effects, and exposed the bishops to the suspicion, if not to the temptation, of avarice. But we must remember that the system censured belongs to the past, and has been superseded by the assignment of fixed payments to future prelates. We have already endeavoured to show that the incomes so given cannot be considered inordinate, when compared with the standard of other professions. We may add that munificent donations to all religious and charitable objects are expected from the bishops, both by their own dioceses and by the public; and that such expectations are hardly ever disappointed.

---

* By 6 and 7 Will. 4. c. 77.

† These were the words of Mr. Peto in the House of Commons, May 26. 1853, and were echoed by 'The Times,' June 21.

We have thus attempted to expose the fallacies involved in some popular schemes of Church reform. But we are far from thinking that no reform is needed in our ecclesiastical economy. Much indeed has been done during the last twenty years, but more remains to do. It is gratifying, however, to see every indication that the changes still required are now likely to be effected with less hesitation than formerly. The feeling of Parliament on these subjects responds to the wishes of the public, and is ready to welcome every well considered project of improvement. The measure which has attracted most notice among those recently brought forward, is that of Lord Blandford, which stands at the head of our article. We observed with great satisfaction the general assent given by all parties in the House of Commons to the principle of this Bill. Its object is to relieve the bishops and other dignitaries in future to be appointed, from the management of their estates, and to place the property under the administration of the 'Estates Commissioners,' who are empowered to apply the surplus, after paying the dignitaries in question, towards the parochial necessities of the Church, as they may judge most expedient.* It has been objected to this measure that it gives to the three Estates Commissioners powers too great to be wielded by so small a body of officials. But this we regard as one of the most valuable features of the Bill. It does in fact create a rudimentary *department of ecclesiastical affairs;* but with this advantage over a ministerial department, that the board would be independent of all party influence, its members being appointed for life. The small number of the board is also a recommendation, because it secures their acting with a due sense of individual responsibility. We should see the adoption of this measure with peculiar pleasure, because it is obviously a step towards the reestablishment of some instrument of Church government intermediate between Parliament and the clergy. We have from time to time taken occasion to point out how much such an instrument is needed. Its best form would, perhaps, be a body of representatives (whereof not less than half should be laymen), elected by the members of the Church of England. This might retain the ancient name, without the defects, of Convocation. The changes ratified by such an assembly would command greater confidence than if they were decreed by Downing Street. But the form of such a council matters little, compared with its functions. Some organ of the kind is absolutely necessary, both to prepare Church

* See clauses 15. and 17. of the Bill.

measures for the sanction of Parliament, and to superintend their execution. Till it exists, there can be no thorough reform in our ecclesiastical machinery.

One of the earliest objects of the attention of such a board, whether created by Lord Blandford's Bill or by any other plan, ought to be the education of the poorer clergy. The existing means provided for this object are wholly inadequate. The Mountain clergy, though their need is the greatest, are not the only section of the profession which suffers from the same deficiency. Probably few persons are aware of the very rapid increase of the non-academic clergy during the last few years. We have ascertained that, in 1851, the total number of deacons ordained was 573, and the total increase of clergy (*i. e.* the excess of ordinations over deaths) was 295. Again, in 1852, the number ordained was 607, and the increase of clergy 320.* In each year, nearly two-thirds of the increase consisted of men who had neither been at Oxford nor Cambridge. Thus the Church is being rapidly recruited with ministers who are destitute of the moral and social advantages (which are worth far more than the intellectual advantages) of academic life. It is true, that a few among the number enjoy these advantages at Durham, and in a less perfect degree at Lampeter†; but from the rest they are wholly withheld. This is a state of things which ought not to continue. It is doubtless most important to create and endow new parishes; but it is equally important that the ministers provided for such parishes should not disgrace themselves in the eyes of their parishioners by incompetence or vulgarity. At present the education of the national schoolmasters, trained at St. Mark's and Kneller Hall,

* In 1851, the new deacons were 202 of Cambridge, 201 of Oxford, and 170 of neither. In 1852, they were 232 of Cambridge, 204 of Oxford, and 171 of neither. We have compiled these returns from the lists of ordinations given in the Ecclesiastical Gazette.

† The recommendation lately given in this Review for conferring extended privileges on Lampeter has been since adopted (at least in part) by the Government. We have acknowledged on a former occasion the benefits conferred upon the northern districts by that noble foundation. It is not impossible that Marlborough College, which is at present charteredfor the education of the sons of the clergy, might, by a slight extension of its plan, be made to serve the same purpose for the south of England which Durham serves for the north; and the character of its present Master (Dr. Cotton) would be a guarantee against that perversion of clerical education to party objects which has ruined similar schemes elsewhere.

is incomparably better than that obtained by three-fourths of the non-academic clergy.

The need of a regular provision for this novel state of things is shown by a phenomenon peculiar to the present day. Colleges for the education of this new class of clergy are established, not by public authority, but by private adventure. A clergyman begins by taking a few pupils, whom he prepares for ministerial functions, by a course of parochial visiting, and 'Pearson on the Creed.' After a time he persuades a bishop to ordain one or two of these pupils without requiring them to take a university degree. The next step is to call his parsonage 'the College of Saint Ignotus,' and to advertise it in the newspapers as a new theological seminary. If a good-natured bishop will consent to be nominated as 'visitor,' the scheme is complete. Candidates for cheap ordination flock to the halls of St. Ignotus; the projector dubs himself Provost, Warden, or President; and a self-created dignitary is added to the Church. We do not say that this is always done from unworthy motives; it may be well to supply an urgent need even by irregular means. But the wants of the Church ought to be met by the deliberate and collective action of her official authorities, not left to the chance-medley of individual speculation.

Another reform demanded by the interest of these poor candidates for the ministry, is the abolition of the enormous ordination fees now exacted by bishop's secretaries. The solicitor who acts in this capacity supplies every clergyman ordained with a small piece of parchment, sealed with the bishop's seal, and called a 'letter of orders.' Before the end of his first twelvemonth, the young curate must pay from 7*l.* to 10*l.**, (*i. e.* about a tenth of his year's salary) for a couple of these documents, including his licence. A single London solicitor is secretary to twenty-three bishops, and receives these fees from about 500 clergy, annually; that is, he derives 4,000*l.* or 5,000*l.* a-year, from this tax upon poverty. These charges admit of no justification. The letters of orders (which, perhaps, cost a shilling apiece) ought to be gratuitously given by the bishop. Indeed, we think it questionable whether the ordination fees are not illegal under the Act 31 Eliz. c. 6., which imposes penalties on those who take or pay money for ordination. Of

* The charge varies in different dioceses; in that of Worcester it is (or was very recently) 9*l.* 4*s.* 6*d.* for the two letters of orders and the licence; in the adjoining diocese of Hereford it is 7*l.* 10*s.* 6*d.* for the same. No reason can be assigned for these variations.

course no blame attaches in this matter to individuals who have only adopted a system long established; but the sooner the practice is discontinued the better.

Akin to this abuse is the extravagant sum abstracted from public purposes by the fees and salaries of the solicitors who act as secretaries and officers of the Boards of Queen Anne's Bounty and the Ecclesiastical Commission. It should be remembered that these funds being devoted to the relief of spiritual destitution, are peculiarly sacred; and it is a painful spectacle to see London attorneys fattening on ecclesiastical famine.

Another important branch of our present subject will shortly be brought before Parliament by the Report of the Cathedral Commissioners. But as this report is not yet published, and as cathedral reform has recently been the theme of a separate paper in this Review, we need not now do more than refer to that Article for a discussion of the details.

The Commission on Cathedrals reminds us of another Royal Commission whose report has perhaps attracted less attention than it deserved. We refer to the Commission appointed in 1849 to consider the best mode of subdividing overgrown parishes. It has recommended the immediate formation of 580 new districts as essential to render the parochial system a reality in England. Of the desirableness of such an addition, after the details published by the Commissioners, there can be no question. But the difficulty is how to provide funds for building and endowing so many churches. The Commissioners recommend a new and rather singular expedient; the sale of the greater part of the livings, now in the gift of the Lord Chancellor.* They reckon upon raising a million from this source; and another million from private contributions. We doubt, however, whether they have sufficiently considered the depreciation which would be produced in the value of advowsons by the nearly simultaneous sale of so many. Their proposal has been objected to, from a fear lest it should injure the patronage of the Crown. In this fear we confess that we do not share. It is no doubt important to keep the great dignities in the gift of the Crown, but we do not see what advantage is gained by putting 777 livings at the disposal of the Lord Chancellor. One benefit resulting from it, is that it keeps up lay influence over the clergy; but this would be equally gained by the sale

* Lord Harrowby's Bill, which we mentioned at the beginning of this Article, adopts another recommendation of these Commissioners, applying the proceeds of the sales of the smaller Chancellor's Livings for the benefit of the particular parishes whose advowsons are sold.

of the same advowsons to private patrons. But we fear that this is a case in which official traditions are likely long to prevail over common sense.

This recommended sale of livings is connected with a subject which formed the theme of several debates in the House of Commons during the last session; we mean, the expediency of altering the laws which regulate the possession and purchase of Church patronage. This has been brought forward, by a new member of the House, Dr. Phillimore, who has shown less judgment and information on this question than his acknowledged abilities and eminent legal acquirements would have led us to expect. In his main proposition, that the present state of the law is anomalous and absurd, and that it causes scandals which ought to be suppressed, we heartily agree with Dr. Phillimore. But to his proposed remedy we object for two reasons; first, because it would be no cure; and secondly, because, if it were, it would be worse than the disease. But, before we give our reasons for this opinion, let us recapitulate the anomalies complained of in the existing law. 1. It is legal both for laymen and clergy to purchase an *advowson*, whether the living be vacant or full, but such purchase cannot convey the presentation to a vacant living. 2. It is legal for a layman to purchase a *next presentation*, if the living be full. 3. It is illegal for a clergyman to purchase a *next presentation*. 4. It is illegal for any one to purchase a *next presentation* when the living is vacant. 5. It is legal for a clergyman to give a bond to resign a living for certain specified relatives of the patron. 6. It is illegal to give a general resignation bond. These inconsistencies are absurd enough in themselves, but appear still more monstrous when it is remembered that the transactions prohibited, though not morally differing from those sanctioned, are stigmatised as *simoniacal*. The origin of this application of that term, and of all these anomalies, is to be found in the fact, that the present state of the law represents a compromise between two antagonistic systems. It is the result of a long struggle between the Common Law and Canon Law. In fact, the questions reopened by Dr. Phillimore (himself a *Doctor Canonici Juris*, and therefore a partisan in the strife,) are fragments, so to speak, of the great contest of investitures, which so long divided the temporal and spiritual powers throughout Europe. According to the strict theory of the Canon Law, no lay patronage was recognised, but the bishop had the sole disposal of all Church offices. As a check upon his power, the rights of private patrons were created by the Common Law. The Church of Rome, during the contest of investitures, branded her opponents with the ugly stigma of

*simony;* and the Romanising traditions of the Canon Law have applied this nickname to transactions which have not the slightest resemblance to that sin of Simon Magus from which the term is derived. Blackstone forcibly points out this misapplication of the word, and observes that 'the true (though not the common) 'notion of simony,' is 'if any person obtain orders, or a licence to 'preach, by money or corrupt practices;' an offence which (by 31 Eliz. c. 6.) is punishable, both in the person giving and receiving such orders, by fine and incapacity of preferment. Thus it would be true simony (under this Act of Elizabeth), if a bishop were to ordain a disqualified relative for the corrupt purpose of providing him with preferment.* This 'true notion 'of simony,' however, has been superseded by the technical usage of the word, in which it is applied to *any illegal transfer of patronage.* Not satisfied with this extension of the term, Dr. Phillimore wishes to stretch it still farther, so as to include the sale of *next presentations*, which his Bill proposes to forbid. But this prohibition, instead of rectifying the anomalies of the law, would only introduce a new inconsistency. There are only two methods by which the law would be rendered consistent; either by absolutely prohibiting the alienation of patronage, or by legalising it without restriction. The former is the true object of that party which Dr. Phillimore represents; the party which seeks to approximate the ecclesiastical laws and customs of England as nearly as possible to those of Rome. Dr. P. himself professes for the present to respect the right of private patronage; but his adherents are less cautious. The 'Guardian' newspaper, in its vigorous articles in defence of Dr. P.'s Bill, openly declares that he does not go far enough, and that the sale of advowsons must also be made illegal. The direct consequence of this is that the right of private patronage must be abolished, for (as Paley well remarks)† patronage if inalienable from the inheritance would devolve on the most indigent and therefore the most improper hands. Moreover, the reasons alleged for prohibiting the sale of presentations apply much more forcibly against the sale of advowsons. The main argument urged by Dr. Phillimore and Lord Goderich, the two champions of the measure, was that the power of buying presentations induces men to take orders from corrupt motives. Now if this were true of the sale of present-

* One of the best examples of true simony on record is the case of a bishop in the last century, who is said to have paid his wife's gambling debt by ordaining and preferring the son of the winner.

† Moral Philosophy, book 3.

ations, it would be more true of the sale of advowsons, and most true of the permanent possession of advowsons. This will be evident, if we consider the circumstances under which the two kinds of property are held. The purchaser of an advowson becomes, from the time of the purchase, the owner of what is called a 'family living.' Thenceforward that living may be filled, as often as it falls vacant, at the discretion of himself and his representatives. Of course, it will naturally be given to some near relative, and will act as an inducement to some of the family to take orders. And the longer it is held in the same family, the oftener does it exercise this biassing influence upon the young of successive generations. On the other hand, the purchaser of a presentation buys it for some definite person, who is either already in orders, or is intending to take orders before the purchase is made. For example, a merchant has three or four sons, who have their profession to choose, and he intends to give them 5000*l.* apiece, to start them in the particular line of life which they prefer. One son chooses the army, and his portion is employed in the purchase of his commission and the subsequent steps. A second chooses to enter an attorney's office, and his money purchases him a lucrative partnership. A third prefers emigration, carries his capital with him to Australia, and returns a millionaire in twenty years. A fourth son of studious habits and devout temper wishes to become a clergyman. His father warns him that he is selecting a life of comparative poverty, and that he can invest his fortune for him better in almost any other line than in the Church. But the son adheres to his choice, and the father invests his 5000*l.* in the purchase of a presentation with prospect of early possession; by virtue of which the son succeeds, in due time, to a professional income of four or five hundred a year. Plainly he has not been induced to choose his profession by pecuniary motives, but by taste and conscious fitness; and the pecuniary advantage, such as it is, has followed upon his choice, not preceded it. It is obvious that the men who succeed to livings thus purchased will be amongst the most disinterested members of their profession. They will usually have other resources, independent of their tithes; and they will be free from the mean and odious motives which actuate the clerical adventurer, who seeks his preferment from the patronage of the bishops or the Crown. Dr. Phillimore's Bill would exclude a large proportion of that most valuable class of men who (as we have before seen) bring their private fortune to eke out the pittance which they receive as the wages of their ministry.

Another point strongly urged by the advocates of this

measure, was the expediency of putting an end to those disgraceful scandals sometimes witnessed when a living in private patronage becomes unexpectedly vacant. It occasionally happens that the patron, desirous to sell the next presentation, and being forbidden by law to sell it during vacancy, presents an old man upon the brink of the grave, and thus enables himself legally to sell the presentation, with a prospect of speedy possession. Several cases of this kind have been recently brought before the public by that indefatigable agitator, Mr. S. G. Osborne. But it is strange that Dr. Phillimore did not perceive that these cases, so far from furnishing an argument for his Bill, tell directly against it. For the scandal is caused, not by legalising the sale of presentations, but by forbidding it in one particular case. If the patron could sell the presentation while the living was vacant, he would have no temptation to fill it with a broken-down old man. It would be bought, under the circumstances which we have already described, for some young clergyman who has been ordained out of preference for the clerical profession. Whereas Dr. Phillimore's Bill would not at all remedy the scandal in question; for patrons capable of conduct so disgraceful would still put in their incompetent old nominees, and sell the advowson instead of the presentation. We may add that these appointments might be prevented, without any alteration of the law, by the instituting bishop. For the patron has only the right of *presenting* a nominee; it is the bishop who must *institute*, and he is bound to refuse institution to an unfit man.* It should be farther observed that the prohibition of the present law, which prevents the sale of presentations during vacancy, is peculiarly absurd; for if they are to be sold at all, the most proper time for the sale is the vacancy of the living. There is a certain degree of gambling in the purchase of advowsons and presentations at present. The purchaser must speculate on the probable duration of the in-

* The worst case of this kind which has occurred was that of St. Ervan's in the diocese of Exeter. In this case the bishop instituted an old man in the last stage of decrepitude, who, as the bishop's secretary is forced to acknowledge, was, at the time of his induction, 'incapable personally to discharge the duties of his office,' (see Mr. Osborne's letter in 'The Times' of Aug. 20. 1853,) and who died two or three months afterwards. The Bishop of Exeter has publicly announced his determination to refuse institution to every clergyman who may agree with the theological sentiments of the Archbishop; but it appears that personal incapacity to discharge clerical duties is no bar to institution in his diocese. We presume that the palsied old presbyter of St. Ervan's was 'sound on the baptismal question.'

cumbent's life; and there is something disgusting in the notion of an expectant watching the failing health of a possessor.

But again, it is argued by Dr. Phillimore that the right of patronage is a sacred trust, and ought to be executed conscientiously, not sold for money. Now, in the first place, this proves too much for Dr. P.'s purpose; since he permits the sale of advowsons, though he forbids that of presentations. But, moreover we cannot force patrons to be conscientious by Act of Parliament. On this point Dr. P. is guilty of a kind of moral contradiction in terms; for he assumes the would-be vendor to desire to perform an unconscientious action and yet compels him to retain a power which cannot be duly exercised but by a conscientious man. The truth is that, for the reasons already given, the purchaser of such property is likely to make a better nomination than the vendor.

It is to be regretted that these very obvious flaws in Dr. Phillimore's arguments were not exposed by any of the opponents of his measure. They took their stand on the rights of property; and Mr. Butt, the principal speaker against the Bill, represented it as 'an act of wholesale confiscation.' This was a valid objection as against the Bill in its present shape; but might be met by the insertion of a compensation clause. Whereas no compensation would remove the real evils of the measure, which we have attempted to explain.

Even supposing that Dr. Phillimore's principles could be carried fully out to their legitimate consequence, in the abolition of all private patronage (a *rasa tabula* being made of opposing vested interests) what would be the gain? The Crown and the bishops would then be the only patrons in the country. Is it probable that the livings would, on the whole, be then better filled than at present? It is not very difficult to answer this question, by looking at the actual holders of Crown and episcopal livings. Nay, if we could go farther still, and devise some Utopian scheme of patronage, expressly constructed for the reward of merit, it is very doubtful whether such a plan would not cause more evils than it cured; whether it might not foster hypocrisy as much as it might encourage virtue. The present system of patronage, though theoretically very imperfect, works well upon the whole. It secures, at any rate, two very important objects; first, the due influence of the laity in Church appointments *; and secondly, the fair representation of theological parties. The latter desideratum could scarcely be achieved

* At present two-thirds of the livings in England and Wales are in private patronage.

by any method of synodical or popular election, because, under such a constitution the preferment would be given exclusively to the adherents of the dominant party. At the same time, the actual condition of things produces, it must be owned, some scandals, and is blemished by some abuses. These might be removed, *quoad temporalia*, by legalising the sale of presentations without restriction; and *quoad spiritualia*, by making the preparation and examinations for holy orders more stringent than at present; by rendering the Diaconate (according to its true design) a kind of apprenticeship to the Ministry, and allowing deacons to withdraw from their profession if they found themselves unfitted for its duties; perhaps also by requiring that no incumbent should be instituted below the age of thirty; and possibly by permitting to the parishioners a veto on the presentation, under conditions such as those imposed by Lord Aberdeen's Act in Scotland. We rejoice in the parliamentary discussion of this very important subject of patronage, and hope that it may lead in time to some well considered measures of amendment, which will (we may venture to predict) be very different from that propounded by Dr. Phillimore.

There may be much difference of opinion upon many of the topics discussed in the preceding pages; but there is one point at least connected with the ecclesiastical revenues on which all must agree; namely, that Parliament has the power (whether it have the right or not) to apply these revenues to such purposes as it may judge most beneficial; and moreover, that it has exercised this power repeatedly in times past. This being the case, it may seem strange that there should be a possibility of its throwing away any part of this property, thus placed at its own disposal, from disliking the mode in which it is levied, or the purposes to which it is now applied. Yet this is not a mere possibility, but has already actually happened. By the Irish Tithe Commutation Act, for example, a quarter of the tithe was abandoned to the landowners, in order to conciliate their support. And this was only in accordance with the Irish Church Temporalities Act passed in 1833, by which church rates in Ireland were made no longer payable by the proprietors from whom they had formerly been due, but charged upon a fund formed by the suppression of ten supernumerary bishoprics. We do not deny that these measures were justified by strong motives of public policy; but we may venture to regret that it was not found possible to apply the property taken from the Church to other public purposes. For example, it was undoubtedly wise not to extort rates for Protestant churches from a Roman Catholic people; but one naturally is tempted to wish

that the same annual sum had been levied on the same property as a school rate. Had this been done, the large grant now annually voted for Irish education might have been spared.

In the late debate on English church rates, it was proposed by Mr. Hume to follow the Irish precedent, and charge the rates upon the funds of the Ecclesiastical Commission; and even Sir G. Grey is reported to have said that he saw nothing objectionable in such a scheme. The subject of Church Rates is too important to be treated at the end of an article; and we hope to return to it at an early opportunity. We will therefore content ourselves for the present with expressing our doubts of the soundness of a plan which would not merely absorb the whole of a revenue so recently devoted (by repeated Acts of Parliament) to other and far more important objects; but also would give an annual bonus of nearly half a million sterling to the owners of land and houses.*

It is doubly important at present to make this protest on behalf of the property of the public; because symptoms are not wanting of an unnatural coalition between Protectionist Toryism and Sectarian Democracy. Dissenters, who hate the Church more than they love the country, seem willing to gratify the unholy hunger of disappointed landlords hankering after the tithes. Several Protectionists in Parliament have spoken of the endowment of the Church as a burden on agriculture. And in this they have an imitator and ally in Mr. Allen, the Quaker, who has lately published a thick octavo against "State Churches," wherein he proposes that the nation should give up, if not the whole at least half the tithes, as a compensation to the agriculturists for the repeal of the corn-laws. Such a prospect is no doubt very alluring to the squire whose rent has been reduced; yet we trust that it is not very likely to be realised by Parliament. As to church rates, the irregularity of their recurrence, their semi-voluntary character, and other peculiarities, may perhaps blind the Legislature to the fact that in abolishing them it sacrifices a portion of its own rights over property. But the case of tithes is far more simple, and if Parliament should ever abandon them, it will do it with its eyes open. Few but those who are deeply interested or deeply ignorant will follow the Protectionist leaders in calling the property of the titheowner a burden on agriculture. It would be as reasonable to say that

* It is true that the legal incidence of church rates is theoretically *in personam;* but being, in the words of Lord Campbell (when Attorney General, in the House of Commons March 3. 1837), 'a 'charge on the person *in respect of the land,*' they are practically a charge on real property.

Lord Sefton's property in Lancashire was a burden on Lord Derby's property in the same county. For the titheowner and the landlord are in reality joint owners of the soil; nor has the landlord, nor any of his ancestors, ever possessed the titheowner's portion of the property. If the tithe be in arrear, the titheowner takes possession of the land, and retains it till the arrears be satisfied.* In many parishes the tithes have been commuted for land; and there it must be clear to the dullest farmer that the parson's estate in the parish is no burden upon his farming.

The term of *a burden upon agriculture* can only be correctly applied to that which prevents the agriculturist from bringing his produce into the market on equal terms with his competitors, or (in other words) which tends to throw the land out of cultivation. Now the farmer takes his land subject to the rights both of the landowner and of the titheowner; and the rent which he agrees to pay is the surplus remaining (after satisfying the claim of the titheowner) above the profit due to his own time and capital. Whenever the land yields such a surplus, the landlord of course will take it; and the extinction of tithe will make no difference to the farmer, who will pay the tithe to the landlord (as farmers of abbey-lands know full well) in the shape of an increased rent. But supposing the land to yield no rent, but only to produce enough to pay farmer's profit and tithe; still the tithe is no burden on the cultivation, though its existence, no doubt, diminishes the income of the landowner. Lastly, suppose the extreme case, when the land will not yield enough, after paying the titheowner, to remunerate the farmer; then, by the present law, the land becomes for the time the property of the titheowner, who will cultivate it for his own profit if its cultivation yields any profit at all. Consequently, there would be, even in this case, no tendency to throw the land out of cultivation, unless its cultivation would be impossible under any circumstances. There was, indeed, under the old law, a case in which tithe might have acted as a burden on agriculture. It sometimes happened that landowners were hindered from bringing waste land into cultivation, because it would not yield a profit after deducting a tenth of the produce, which was then due to the titheowner. But this impediment exists no longer; for no tithe-rentcharge is payable on any land which was not already in cultivation at the time of the passing of the Commutation Act.

While we are on this subject, we cannot help mentioning the original view put forward by Mr. Allen (the Quaker writer

---

* By 6 & 7 Will. 4. c. 71. s. 82.

before quoted) in defence of those who try to shake off this ecclesiastical burden. It has been often remarked that the owner of property is bound in justice to pay the tithes, because the purchase-money paid for his land was diminished by the value of the titheowner's interest in the soil. Mr. Allen replies that if the estate had been subject to the periodical incursions of a band of armed robbers, it would have sold for so much less in the market; but that its purchaser would not be therefore bound to submit to the depredations of the marauders. This answer shows a happy union of respect for law and perception of morality — '*Compositum jus fasque animo!*'*

The above remarks may perhaps suffice in reply to the Protectionist assailants of the Church. With regard to their democratic allies, who are so eager to destroy the Establishment that they wish to make the squires a present of its funds, it will probably occur to them, before the bargain is executed, that they may buy their whistle at a cheaper rate. They may take the tithe from the priest, and give it to the schoolmaster or the parish surgeon. Instead of pulling down the Church, they may turn it into a music hall or a mechanics' institute. However they may detest the 'superstitious uses' to which its revenues are now devoted, they are at liberty (saving vested interests) to apply them to more utilitarian purposes; and the application of them to any public purpose whatever would be better than their transfer to the owners of the soil. The fate of the Establishment amid the changes and chances of a government continually becoming more popular, is difficult to foresee. It may be maintained; it may be mutilated; or it may be demolished. But whatever be its destiny, we trust that it will be saved from that worst sacrilege, absorption in the maw of private selfishness. We trust that no future Parliament will rob the nation to enrich the landlords; nor fill the lap of luxury with the heritage of the poor.

* A clergyman of our acquaintance was formerly the owner of a house and garden which was subject to a rent-charge of 10*l.* per annum payable for the repair of the Quakers' meeting-house. We wonder whether Mr. Allen would apply his marauding theory to this instance.

ART. IV. — *First Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into and report upon the System of superintending and executing Public Works, in the Madras Presidency.* Submitted to the Right Honourable the Governor in Council of Fort St. George on the 23rd December, 1852. Madras: 1852.

IN January, 1850, the Court of Directors instructed the Government of Madras to appoint a commission for the purpose of inquiring into and reporting on the system under which Public Works are carried on in that Presidency. The Government of Madras carried that order into effect in February, 1851; and the first result has been this admirable Report, of which it is but faint praise to say that it is the most valuable work that has yet been printed at the Madras press. Its value consists in a clear exposition of facts and principles; and the conclusions to which it leads can scarcely fail to be for the most part acted on, and, when acted on, to produce a marked effect on the well-being of the people in the provinces subject to Madras.

In England, where so much is done by private enterprise, the term Public Works scarcely conveys that extensive meaning which attaches to it in countries in which the Government is the prime agent in all considerable undertakings; and besides the roads, canals, harbours, lighthouses, &c., which may be obviously suggested by it here, there is in Madras, as is well known, an extensive class of works, those of Irrigation, which are altogether the province of the Government. This arises from the fact that all the cultivated land of the country pays an assessment to the State, which, from its inequality, it is difficult to estimate correctly, but which may be roughly stated at from 30 to 40 per cent. of the gross produce. For purposes of assessment the land may be divided into two great classes; one of which, watered only by the rains, bears generally a crop of inferior value, and is subject to all the variations which occur in the quantity of rain that falls from year to year; while the other, being irrigated artificially, has a greater abundance and a less fluctuating supply of water, grows more valuable products, and yields a greatly larger return. The State alone, which receives so large a share of the gross produce, is in a position to undertake the formation, or attend to the repair, of the great works which distribute water over extensive tracts of country, or in fact of any work which cannot be executed by the inhabitants of a single village in a few days, and for

their own sole benefit. For the increased fertility conferred on the land by works of irrigation, the State receives a greatly enhanced assessment; but the cultivator finds also his due advantage in the greater value of the crop, and his comparative independence of the seasons.

In our climate, water is in excess, and draining is the chief instrument of artificial fertilisation. In India, water is in deficiency; irrigation is there the chief means of fertilising the land, and in some years the only means of rescuing it from entire barrenness. In England, the landowner is a private individual, and he generally defrays the chief cost of draining for the occupier. In India, the Government is the landlord; the occupiers of the soil are for the most part miserably poor; irrigation can only be conducted on a large scale; and therefore the expense of it, whenever it is adequately performed, must be defrayed by the Government.

The Madras territories lie between the eighth and twentieth degrees of north latitude. They are all, therefore, exposed to the burning sun of the tropics; but the two coasts have seasons in a great degree different from each other. Along the whole length of the western coast, there is a narrow slip of low land, scarcely exceeding forty miles in width, which is bounded on one side by the sea, and on the other by the great chain of mountains called the Western Ghauts. In this narrow tract, and on the crest of the neighbouring mountains, the westerly periodical rains, which fall from June to October, never fail. Their influence extends, with diminished force and certainty, about half across the peninsula. But nature has made some compensation for their absence in the form of the land, for the whole watershed of the wide country from the Western Ghauts to the Bay of Bengal is eastward, and the numerous rivers and smaller watercourses, many of them dry for months, which rise in the Western Ghauts, or within the range of the westerly rains, bear annually to the Bay of Bengal vast volumes of water, with which the burnt-up plains of the Carnatic may be fertilised.

On the western coasts, 130 inches of rain are no uncommon fall, and on some exposed points as much as 400 inches has been known to fall within a year. But on the eastern coast, the average fall of rain is but 48 inches, and that with the greatest irregularity, nearly the whole being in six weeks of October and November. Five or ten inches sometimes fall in a day, so that, unless stored up, the greater part is useless for cultivation. But sometimes the rains fail altogether, and in such a season the want of artificial means of preserving the water makes itself felt. We have seen what are the effects of the destruction

of the potato crop in Ireland, of only one portion of the harvest, in a country intersected by roads, and nowhere a hundred miles distant from the sea. From that visitation it may be conceived what must be the sufferings of the people when there has not fallen rain enough to permit the seed to be sown,—when the earth is indeed of iron, and the heaven of brass,—when not a blade of corn springs up for the food of man, and not a blade of grass for the food of cattle. Such was the case in the Guntoor district in 1833. The periodical rains had failed generally on the Coromandel coast, and at Guntoor had failed entirely. In Tanjore, where artificial irrigation is on a large scale, the evil was comparatively little felt. But in Guntoor the blow fell with all its force. The area of the district is 4700 square miles, and it contained, in 1832, 512,000 inhabitants, of whom it is believed that no less than 200,000 died of starvation and of the fever which succeeded the famine. The conformation of the land in this district peculiarly suits it for irrigation, as the ground slopes down from an elevated centre, and the ruined works of former rulers attest the use to which this circumstance was once put. To prevent the recurrence of such a calamity as that which occurred in 1833, a work of irrigation was some time since ordered by the Court of Directors, which would ensure a permanent supply of water for a great extent of land. The estimated expense of this work is only 155,000*l.*, and it is calculated that it would yield an increase of revenue of not less than 73,000*l.* yearly, or 48 per cent. on the outlay; and we are told, 'even the Government express their opinion that the 'permanent annual gain to the revenue will not fall short of '30 per cent.' This important work was long deferred on account of the want of engineers; but it has now for two years been vigorously prosecuted, and when once it is completed, the recurrence of such a visitation as that of 1833 becomes extremely improbable.

It is sufficiently evident from this simple instance how great is the value of such works, whether they are intended to store up the rain water in a tank, or to collect or distribute the supply which flows along the beds of rivers.

Their construction and repair is both a duty and a source of profit, and it was not neglected by the ancient rulers of the country. Excluding the western coast, the Madras territories contain eighteen districts, in all of which such works are required. In fourteen of those districts, omitting Tanjore, the best irrigated of all, the public accounts show that there are upwards of 43,000 works in repair, besides more than 10,000 out of repair, all of which were constructed before the English had

possession of the country. Many of these were formed with little engineering skill, many with a view to ostentation, or to perpetuate the name of the founder, rather than to a profitable return; but taken together they form an aggregate of property of the highest importance. The public revenue derived from them is no less than 1,350,000*l.* yearly, besides 150,000*l.* more, which have been alienated under the form of rent-free holdings, making a total of a million and a half sterling annually. The average yearly cost of their repairs for the last ten years has been 70,000*l.* Looking beyond the mere interest which the Government has in these works, and assuming the Government share to be two-fifths of the whole crop, the entire yearly produce must be estimated at three millions and three quarters sterling.

The works may be classed in two divisions, under the heads of channels and tanks. One class of channels depends on the low freshes of the rivers, to take advantage of which either a permanent stone drain is constructed, or a temporary one of earth is thrown up every year. The water is thus conveyed into a channel, sometimes fifty miles long, and is let out to the lands which require it by sluices in the banks. Another class of channels depends on the high floods, and obtains the water in a similar manner, and, the supply being more precarious, conveys it to one or more tanks, where it remains stored up for use. A tank is constructed like any fish pond in England, by throwing an earthen embankment across a valley; but the size of these reservoirs is very usually such that it is necessary to protect the dam against the action of the waves by a revetment of rough stones. Some of these tanks are, indeed, worthy of the name of lakes, such as the Cauverypauk and Veeranum tanks, of which the embankments are respectively four and nine miles long, or the still greater Pounairy tank, in the Trichinopoly country, now out of repair, the dam of which is twenty-six miles long. These embankments are pierced by sluices of masonry, by means of which the water is let out below when required. There are usually one or more outlets, called Calingalas, constructed of masonry, near the end of the embankment, and formed as a precaution against sudden floods. For this purpose they are lower than the general level of the embankment, so that the superfluous water passes out through them, and when the season of supply is ending they are closed up. One or two rows of stone pillars are usually built into the masonry across the outlet to support the temporary dam thus constructed.

It will readily be understood that works of such extent and

magnitude must stand in need of frequent repairs. These may be either emergent, as when an embankment is breached, and must be repaired forthwith, in order to save the water and the produce of the year; or ordinary, which include all such as are requisite to meet the action of waves, running water, and sudden floods, in wearing away earth-work, or damaging stone-work,—repairs, in short, which are as much a necessity for the preservation of the permanent effectiveness of these constructions, as those of a carriage or steam engine. We have stated that 70,000*l.* has been the average yearly cost of the repairs, an amount which, if we assume, with the authors of this Report, that the original outlay on existing works was fifteen millions sterling, is only one half per cent. yearly on the first cost, while in England canals and works of that class require from three to four per cent. Any argument, however, which is thus brought forward, will depend for its conclusiveness on the correctness with which the original outlay was estimated, and this, it must be owned, is nothing more than a rough guess. We prefer an examination of facts which now exist to enable us to decide how far the repairs have been efficiently executed.

The public accounts of the year 1850, a favourable season, show that in the twelve chief irrigation districts there were under cultivation 1,787,909 acres. The same accounts state the land capable of irrigation to have been 2,682,260 acres, and that nearly 900,000 acres, or about a third of the whole, were not under cultivation, as, had the works been in proper order, they would, for the most part, have been. The accounts, however, though probably in most districts trustworthy, are admitted not to be altogether so; but whatever deductions may be made on this account, there will still remain a vast extent of land which is capable of irrigation by works now existing, but which, from their inefficient state, is not used.

The reports of the engineers who are in charge of the works throughout the country were laid before the Commissioners, and their testimony leads generally to the same conclusion. One states, 'From all that I have learnt respecting works in 'this division, they are in all respects, both as to original 'construction and present condition, in a most imperfect state.' Another reports, 'The whole of the irrigation in the subdivision, 'with the exception of the two Amauny Talooks of Vizaga-'patam, have been almost entirely neglected, and stand in great 'need of repair.' A third says, 'The tanks and channels 'generally are not by any means in a state of good order; many 'sluices are out of repair, more are required; the same as to

'calingalahs (outlets). Land is certainly left uncultivated for 'want of such works, or from their being inefficient.'

Another, while stating that the works are generally in tolerable order, adds, 'A large number of tanks require their sluices 'to be renewed, &c.; and in almost every talook the revenue 'accounts exhibit a loss for want of proper means of irrigation.'

In another division, the engineer officer in charge of the works reports that they are in general good repair; but the Commissioners state that 'there is a large extent of land there, now 'uncultivated for many years, though once irrigated and productive;' and add, 'that all the works of the country are 'below their state of full efficiency, and incapable of effecting 'their proper amount of irrigation. The tanks are in want of 'sluices, or such as they have are out of order; or they have 'no calingalahs, or such as they have are too small or too high, 'and so the stability of the tank is in danger; or the bank is 'low and weak, and the Ryots are afraid to store a full tank; 'or their channels of supply have become choked up, and no 'longer bring a full supply of water.'

The foregoing are extracts from official reports of a very late date. The following is from one written in December 1837, by an officer who had then been for nine years employed on works of irrigation: —

'I have not the least doubt that the expenditure has been totally inadequate. I judge, first from the innumerable instances of works in a defective state, which have come under my own observation. So generally, indeed, have I found the works in a defective state, that I believe I may say that nearly all the tanks in the country, and nearly all the channels also, excepting those of Tanjore, and the very large ones of other districts, water less land than they once did, many only one-fourth, and very great numbers from half to three quarters; and the actual revenue derived from several districts some years ago compared with the present, fully supports me in this opinion. By the statement above given, it appears that the Munjay (irrigation) revenue of North Arcot is 3 lacs (30,000*l.*) below what it was ten years ago, out of 15 lacs; in South Arcot 2 lacs out of 12; and in Tinnevelly $\frac{3}{4}$ lac out of $11\frac{3}{4}$. But the falling off in the Munjay revenue has, I believe, been going on for a long series of years. . . . . This question arises,—Is this deficiency owing to the deficient state of the public works, or to other causes? To this I can only reply, that from what I have seen, I have no doubt it is owing to that cause; and I believe that it will be generally allowed to be so by the revenue officers and engineers who have been employed in the irrigated districts.'

There can be no doubt that the works of irrigation are not generally in a good state of repair; but it is equally certain that

at the date when the last extract was written (1837), they were in a very much worse state than now. In 1838, a material change was made in the distribution of engineer officers; one so material, in fact, as to form an era in the history of the public works. The nature of this will be best explained by an account of its operation on the one district which, among those recently reported on, we have remarked as having its works declared to be generally in good repair by the engineer in charge of them. This is the district of Tinnevelly, which up to 1834 was, with four other districts, the whole comprising an area of 38,460 square miles — altogether one-fifth larger than Ireland — the charge of a single engineer officer. From 1834 to 1838, this vast charge was slightly reduced to 32,880 square miles. But in 1838, the Tinnevelly and Madura districts, forming an area of 16,400 square miles, were allotted as the charge of one officer; —an area greatly too extensive,—a charge infinitely too burdensome, but which still, as compared with what had previously existed, admitted of some control, and enabled the engineer to aim at a general supervision, which before was altogether hopeless. Bearing the data of these changes in mind, we find, in the following extract from the Report, that such improved superintendence, and the additional outlay which it renders possible, are not thrown away, even if considered merely as a commercial speculation:—

'The aggregate income of the first nine years (1822-31), was 94.55.647 rupees, or 10.50.633 rupees annually; and the aggregate expenditure on repairs of the first ten years (1823-32) was 3.22.938 rupees, or 32.293 rupees annually. In the last fifteen years (1837-51) the aggregate income was 1.77.33.875, or 11.82.258 rupees annually; and the outlay on repairs was 807.826, or 53.855 rupees annually. The total excess of the expenditure in these fifteen years over what it would have been on the average of the first ten years, was 3.23.419 rupees; but the aggregate excess of revenue from irrigated land during the last fifteen years, over what it would have been at the average of the first nine, is 19.74.830 rupees.'

The greater part of the above outlay has been in repairs of old works, (not in the formation of new,) or in improvements extending irrigation to land which the imperfection of the old works did not permit to be irrigated, and in rendering tolerably certain the supply of water which before was fluctuating, and the very uncertainty of which was a cause of loss both to the cultivator and to the public revenue. The Tinnevelly district is an instance of improvement by increased attention to many works scattered over the face of the country. As one

showing the contrast between neglect and attention in a narrower space, we may instance the northern portion of the delta of the Cauvery river, called the Talooks of Manargoody and Chillumbrum. Their irrigation had been much neglected, and the channels allowed to fill up, during the earlier years of our possession; but between 1834 and 1839 various repairs and improvements were executed. A dam was thrown across the river, the old channels cleared out, and new ones excavated, and the entire expense of these operations amounted to 35,900*l.* To the public revenue the result has been, that, comparing the average receipts of the eleven years preceding 1834, when the works were begun, with those of the fourteen years succeeding the construction of the dam in 1836, there is an annual gain of 11,500*l.*, or an aggregate in the fourteen years of 161,113*l.*

These are instances of improvement on a large scale; but, while dwelling on these and on others which we have yet to mention, it is well to bear in mind that something more is involved in them than the interests of a government, the profitable investment of capital, or the triumphs of engineering skill. For this end we extract a passage from the Report, which is instructive as showing both the dependence of the prosperity of the people on the maintenance of these works, and the manner in which an imperfect system and an insufficient establishment may combine to prevent their restoration when in want of repair:—

'In connexion with the subject of loss of revenue from neglect to repair works of irrigation, it must never be forgotten that for every hundred rupees of revenue so sacrificed, a further loss of fully one hundred and fifty is entailed on the ryot. Indeed, the loss to him is often total ruin, in cases which the Government only regard as a decline of revenue to the amount of a few hundred or a few thousand rupees out of their hundreds of lacs. For if the tank or channel on which the value of his land depends, is permitted to fall into decay, he has no resource; he cannot even, under the existing revenue arrangement, cultivate it with dry crops, for if he did so, he would have to pay the full rent for irrigated land; and the ground is therefore untilled. The following is an instance of this, and not a very rare one. The tank of the small village of Poottiavauripilly in North Arcot, was breached in 1847 so as to be incapable of holding water. It was not repaired till 1851, the delay being chiefly in consequence of the civil engineer department having had no time to visit it, as the Board of Revenue would not sanction a talook estimate sent up. The ryots, who are poor hardworking people, deeply felt the loss of their tank, and did their best to get water from wells to cultivate a little of the land. The land thus cultivated has yielded 67 rupees a year, while the average collections prior to the breaching of the tank were 426 rupees. The

estimate for the repair of the tank was only 750 rupees. Thus, in this petty case, the Government sustained a positive loss of above 1400 rupees in four years for want of a proper person to estimate for this trifling and simple work. But the loss to the ryots has been much more heavy; they have been reduced to much actual distress.' (*Report*, par. 277.)

The Commissioners proceed to observe, and we fully concur in the opinion, that when a cultivator has invested his capital and labour in land under a tank or channel, and has for a series of years depended upon it for subsistence, and paid the due revenue to Government, the repair of any injury which may happen to the work on which his maintenance is dependent, should not, unless in some extreme cases, be a new question of whether it will be a profitable investment of capital, but that he should be considered entitled, as by an implied contract, to have the necessary repairs executed.

The most striking effects of the extension of irrigation and of the application of engineering skill are undoubtedly to be found in the delta of the Godavery. In 1844 the revenue of that district was just what it had been forty years before, while in Tanjore, a district with no greater capabilities for irrigation, but with the benefit of the peculiar attention paid to it, and of an average yearly expenditure of about 8000*l.* (of which one half was for necessary repairs only, and not for improvements), the revenue rose in the same period by regular gradations from 310,000*l.* to 400,000*l.* In 1844 the revenue from the delta of the Godavery was declining, the people were impoverished and dispirited, when Colonel A. T. Cotton, who has illustrated his name by the great works he has since carried out, proposed a plan for throwing a dam across the river Godavery, and for distributing the water so accumulated by a network of channels over an area of 3000 square miles. At the place where the embankment was to be constructed, the river was two miles wide; it was divided by islands into four channels, and the bed was of sand of unknown depth. The works have since been carried on, as is usually the case, with insufficient means, and not much more than half of the calculated expenditure had taken place up to the end of the official year 1850–1, till which time the results are shown in a statement appended to the Report. These results are some of the most remarkable on record. About 130,000*l.* had been expended, and 110,000*l.* more was expected to complete the work. But, in fact, no real outlay had been made by the Government; for such had been the effect of the employment of capital and labour, and the stimulus given to an impoverished district, that, each year as the works went on,

even in the very first, the revenue rose, and was greater, after deducting the sum expended, than the average of the preceding eleven years. So that the total increase was more than 195,000*l.*; which, after deducting the outlay, left a clear profit of upwards of 65,000*l.*

These are magnificent results; and not many opportunities may be found for projects on so grand a scale, conferring such singular benefits in return for the application of capital. Yet, that it may not be supposed that this is a solitary instance, or that there do not yet exist, scattered through the plains of Southern India, localities which will yield to engineering skill rewards to encourage the most desponding, and satisfy the most greedy, it may be well to refer to a list of all the original works, so far as they could be ascertained, which have been at different times executed in the Madras Presidency from 1836 to 1849, and which is to be found in the Appendix to the Report. Thirty-nine works are enumerated in this catalogue, three of which have, from various circumstances, not been remunerative; the remaining thirty-six have afforded a profit on the money spent upon them, and this to such an extent that, taking the loss with the profit on the whole thirty-nine, not less than 69½ per cent. on the cost is repaid yearly. Thirteen of the thirty-six yield a profit of 134 per cent. on the outlay, and the remainder from 3¾ to 47½ per cent. The entire sum laid out on these original works, has been only 54,100*l.*, the profit on which has been 37,670*l.* a year.

Enough has been said to show that the works of irrigation in the Madras Presidency are of the highest value; that they have not hitherto been kept in really efficient repair; that, if made fully efficient, they would justify the saying, that what is worth doing at all, is worth doing well; that both repairs and original works, if well selected,—in other words, if sufficient engineering skill is available,—are capable of producing results in return for the outlay of capital, such as are not dreamt of in more fully cultivated countries; and that the amount which has as yet been laid out, in original works especially, is paltry when compared with the extent of the Madras territories, 138,000 square miles. These advantages are altogether irrespective of the increased and less fluctuating supply of food, of employment for capital and labour, of the stimulus given to the exertions of the population, of the moral effects of plenty in facilitating their improvement.

Closely connected with the subject of works of irrigation, is that of internal communication. It is needless at this day to insist on the importance of roads, or to contrast the situation of

a country pierced with canals or railroads with that of one which has not even common metalled roads. But one point is worth observing, that in an inland country without roads, and where a heavy assessment is fixed on the land, it is possible that the construction of a great work of irrigation may be highly beneficial to the persons immediately affected by it, and may add greatly to their means of employing capital, while the great increase of food thus produced may, by there being no means of export, have even a deteriorating effect on the situation of some neighbours, whose fixed money assessment will, from the fall in the price of grain, bear a still greater proportion to the value of the gross produce of their land than it did before the work was constructed. Hence there may arise a necessity for reconsidering the Government assessment, and this, being a great deviation from official routine, may create, and we believe has created in some quarters, a strong feeling against all increase of works of irrigation, instead of producing, as might naturally be expected, a strong desire to apply the proper remedy of improved communications. It may be added that where there are no means of reaching the sea, and thus entering into the great market of the world, whatever is produced must be chiefly for local consumption, and from this cause the great staples, whether produced on irrigated land or not, of sugar, cotton, indigo, are altogether neglected for the production of food alone. The remedy for this, the obvious remedy, is a road, by means of which the grain may be exported; and a still more valuable advantage, by means of which the people may find it profitable, not exclusively to attend to the production of food, but to grow the far more costly products we have mentioned.

It is difficult to convey a correct idea of the state of the roads in the Madras country. They may be arranged in three classes, — those to which nothing whatever has been done, — those to which something has been done, — and those which are called trunk roads, and which are supposed to be on the footing of our turnpike roads. The first class forms the vastly greater portion of the whole. Any one who has seen a track across a common in Scotland, along which cattle are customarily driven, can conceive what these roads are. If the country is rough and stony, nothing but men and animals can pass along them; if smooth and even, carts are in use, unless hedges have been allowed to grow up so close on either hand as to prevent the passage of any thing wider than a loaded bullock. In either case, nature, and the traffic along the road, have made it what it is. The third class, the trunk roads, so far as they really exist, consist of a road from Madras due westward to the opposite sea coast; a

road from Madras to Trichinopoly; and one or two other roads, such as one from Coimbatore to the western coast. On the first, that from Madras to Bangalore, transit carriages, travelling six miles an hour, convey private travellers; although this is the most considerable line of passage for English travellers. Much even of it is unbridged. Of all these roads, however, there is not a mile, outside of the British stations, which is equal to a common turnpike road. As for the so-called northern trunk road, it has no real existence; 5,600*l.* have been spent on it in four years; pieces have been made here and there, but in a line seven hundred miles long, they are but few and far between. We described the second class of roads as those to which something has been done; but what has been done to them it is difficult to describe, from the variety in the nature of the roads, and the means applicable to improving them. Some lines on a good soil were impassable for want of bridges; others were throughout on a bad soil; others had difficult passes through chains of hills. A bridge or two in the first, and a well-traced line opened in the last, might make them greatly superior to what they were in their original state, and render them capable of permitting traffic to pass along them without difficulty; while nothing but a considerable outlay would form a passable road out of one labouring under the disadvantages of a bad soil throughout.

The district of Tanjore has been fortunate in roads as well as in works of irrigation. During the last twenty years about 800*l.* a year has been spent on the roads by the Government, and about 1,500*l.* a year has been assigned to that purpose from the surplus of the pagoda funds which were managed by the Government. These sums have been laid out chiefly in building bridges, which, in a delta intersected by canals, are an absolute necessity. The connecting roads have been generally formed at the expense of the landholders, by heaping up earth two or three feet high so as to form a level causeway, and covering it with a layer of sand from the nearest canal. Of such roads there are 534 miles in an area of 4000 square miles, and, however rude and incapable of bearing a heavy traffic, they are of the highest value to the population.

The district of Salem has long been regarded as preeminent for the excellence of its roads. This originated about 1836, when an active collector, Mr. Orr, expended about 4000*l.* in putting the roads in repair; he further introduced a toll on carts, and, by means of the proceeds, and by the contribution of Government, the whole amounting to less than 1000*l.* a year, provided for the roads being kept up within his circle. In this case, the unpaid labour of the landholders was also largely made use

of; and the result at the present day is, that on the best soil for roads in Southern India, there are, in an area of 8000 square miles 400 miles of road, greatly superior to those which have had no care bestowed on them, and suitable to the generally light traffic which passes over them. It should also be added that no attempt has been made to connect this completely inland district with the sea, and to give its small system of roads an outlet to the nearest port. The effort in fact has been an isolated one, and has not formed any part of a system, notwithstanding that it long ago attracted attention, and that really to utilise its results, an outlet to the sea was essential.

The two districts we have mentioned are the most favourable instances to be found in the Madras territories; they are the best provided with roads; and the assessment on the land is comparatively light. It will not be uninstructive to consider the situation of two others which are not so advantageously circumstanced. We will take the two districts of Cuddapah and Bellary, both altogether inland, both with a rich soil, but labouring under a heavy assessment; both, however, having what may be considered an additional claim to some attention to their roads, in the circumstance that the high road from Madras to Bombay runs through them. In 1847 the collector of Cuddapah reported to Government that 'with the exception of a small 'portion of the road leading to Cumbum, the formation of 'which has lately been undertaken on an estimate of 186*l.* 14*s.*, '1867½ rupees, there is not a made road of any description 'throughout the whole length and breadth of this extensive 'province, in which so much trade and commerce are carried on, 'particularly in cotton, sugar, and indigo.' In 1851, however, there are more signs of animation. The Goolcherroo Ghaut, a difficult pass, has been completed, and 'nothing can possibly 'be better than the work; but until it can be approached on 'either side with somewhat less difficulty than at present, its 'value to the merchants must of necessity be comparatively 'small.' No doubt: and its value on the whole must be somewhat impaired by what we learn further, that, with that exception, 'nothing has been done to improve the communications 'in the past year;' and also, 'that roads, properly so called, can 'hardly be said to exist.'

The Cuddapah district, it should be observed, has an area of 12,970 square miles, and a population of 1,450,000 souls; and contains 3½ miles of made road. The neighbouring district of Bellary has been more fortunate. It contains upwards of 13,000 square miles, and up to 1847, had had an average expenditure of 158*l.* a year on its roads during the preceding

twenty years. It stands on the list as having nine miles of made road.

In 1850 the collector says in his annual report:—

'"I have nothing further to add to my report dated the 22d "October 1849, the orders of Government on which I am still ex-"pecting." He refers to some repairs on a small part of the Bellary and Dharwar road, on an estimate to the amount of rupees 6.177 13, as on the point of completion; and notices for the further estimate (for rupees 25.200) had not yet received the sanction of Government. He closes his short and hopeless report with a repetition of his request that some plan for making roads through Bellary may be authorised and commenced upon.' (*Report*, par. 346.)

The four districts we have noticed, show a marked difference in the treatment they have received at the hands of the British Government. In the first two, some attention has been directed towards creating a system of passable cross roads, though, in the main lines which are in India called trunk roads, they are nearly wholly deficient. In the last two, on the contrary, so little has been done, that it may fairly be said that no attention whatever has been given to the improvement of the roads. So striking a difference would lead to the belief that there has never been any systematic endeavour to improve the roads of the country, and that this great engine for the advancement of commerce has been altogether neglected. The conclusion, however, would not be substantially right, inasmuch as it would not do justice to the good intentions which caused the establishment of a superintendent of roads, and placed all the chief communications of the country under his care, with a fixed yearly fund at his disposal.

A slight sketch of the subject will show that the complete apathy with which the improvement of the roads was originally regarded has gradually changed for a generally earnest desire on the part of the Government to effect that object while the extracts from official documents which have already been given, show that the same wish pervades the great body of the local officers. The difficulties in the way of progressive improvement have been those which arise not only from disinclination, but from the want of money, of proper establishments, and of that wide and systematic view of the whole subject, which could alone clear away such obstacles, but which no one has ever had time to take, and which is now, for the first time, partially supplied by the present Report.

In 1817, the Court of Directors ordered that the ferry funds, a small branch of revenue arising from the leasing out of ferries, and not amounting to more than 3500*l.* a year,

should be assigned to the improvement of the roads. Subsequently but many years ago, this was done in the north of India, where a local committee in each district manages the revenue from ferries. But the Government of Madras of that day did not even take the trouble to carry out this order, and it has never been acted on. From 1817 to 1835, the chief improvement made in the roads was by means of the military corps of Pioneers; and this, though but a small body of men, did much good service, more especially in opening passes through the chains of mountains by which the Peninsula is intersected. These passes were, it is true, often too steep for wheels, or nearly so; but, such as they were, they were infinitely superior to the old tracks, and were fit for the passage of loaded pack bullocks, which before had either to be lightly loaded, or to have their burdens carried on men's heads through the pass. In one instance, a large sum was spent on a road made by the combined labour of the pioneers and common workmen, — so large, and with such unsatisfactory results, that the Government resolved in 1831 to make no more lines of road. From 1836 to 1842, Lord Elphinstone was Governor of Madras; and, among several beneficial measures to which his attention to this branch of his Government led, one may be cited which has become of permanent advantage to the country. This was the formation of the Western Trunk Road, leading from Madras towards Bangalore, on which a great traffic is now carried on, the heaviest, probably, on any road in India. Lord Tweeddale succeeded as Governor in 1842, and the result of the attention which he paid to the subject was the appointment of an engineer officer as superintendent of the department of roads, and the assignment by the Court of Directors of a fund of 40,000*l.* a year to be expended by it. The Court directed that the outlay on trunk roads should not exceed that sum, but observed that the fund was applicable only to trunk roads, and that other roads must be separately provided for. For this purpose, it was ordered that each collector and civil engineer should report every year on the state of the cross roads of his district, and the collectors were authorised to lay out on them fifty rupees a mile, in cases where the civil engineer concurred as to the propriety of the outlay. The latter clause was never acted on. No such authority was given to the collectors, and though their reports have been yearly made, and it has become known through them that there are great inland districts whose crying want is the improvement of their roads, that want has been wholly neglected. The inconvenience of a frequent change of governors is most clearly exhibited, when, as in the

present instance, the favourite plan of one person has to be carried out by his successor. This remark especially applies to what ultimately befell the department of roads. The superintendent, an able and energetic officer, submitted to the Government a statement of the establishment necessary for carrying out the purposes for which his office had been created. The establishment which he proposed was refused, and the new office rendered of no avail: so that after it had existed six years, of the 240,000*l.* which had been assigned to it in that period, only 130,000*l.* had been expended.

Like its predecessor of 1817, the Madras Government of 1842 did not carry out the orders of the Home Government, which assigned a certain fund for the improvement of the roads. Whether from not valuing the object, or from a desire to gain credit for economy, or merely from being too feeble to be capable of breathing energy into so great a work, the fact is certain, that nearly half of the road fund remained unspent, and that the road department was kept in so inefficient a state that one-third of that expenditure nominally made on the roads under its charge, was really laid out on works executed not under its superintendence, but under that of the ordinary district officers.

The disinclination to expend money on roads, thus strongly manifested in not even permitting the expenditure of the amount ordered by higher authority to be laid out upon them, was assuredly not caused by the want of success which had attended the one road already completed, or by the results of a comparison of the money laid out on it, and of the benefits that outlay has produced. The road we allude to is the Western road to Madras. In 1851 it had been, if not completed, at least opened, so as to be fit for traffic, though not bridged throughout, as far as the limits of Mysore, where it joined a road constructed by the Government of that country, and leading to Bangalore. The benefits which have been conferred on commerce by the construction of this road may be inferred from a statement furnished to the Commissioners by a merchant resident at Madras, and extracted from his correspondence with his constituent at Wallajahnuggur, a commercial town inland. Two of the items given will be sufficient for our purpose. In 1837, before the road was commenced, the hire of a cart carrying 900 lbs. between the two places was 10*s.* (5 rupees). In 1851, the improvement of the road enabled the same cart to carry 1600 lbs., and its hire was 7*s.* 3*d.* (3 rupees 10 annas). The cost of the carriage of goods was therefore reduced in 1851 to considerably less than half what it was in 1835; an advantage which, no doubt, was chiefly felt by the

public, but which, as the road is an important military line of communication, and public stores, &c., to a considerable extent pass along it, must have produced a large and calculable saving in the expenditure of Government.

Independent, however, of this source of direct saving, and of the share in the general improvement which must have accrued to the Government, there is, under the system of taxation existing in that country, a branch of revenue which, judging from the results of the construction of this road, seems to promise the reimbursement of much of the money that may hereafter be laid out upon roads from seaports to inland districts. Salt, it is well-known, is a monopoly of Government. Where roads are unimproved, it finds its way laboriously on the backs of bullocks, or on lightly laden carts, into the interior. Its price, raised by the difficulties in the transit, imposes a check on the amount consumed. From Madras itself no salt was exported inland before the construction of the road in question. What went from that part of the coast was exported from the neighbouring district of Chingleput. A comparison of the value of the salt sold on account of Government in different years shows that a vast increase has taken place, the far greater part of which can be attributed to no cause except the opening of the road; for inasmuch as when, by way of compensation for the abolition of the transit duties in 1843, an addition of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. was made to the price of salt, a sudden falling off everywhere occurred in the sales of salt, the subsequent increase of salt revenue in this locality must be attributed only to the effects of the road. Of this increase, it must be observed that not less than 80 per cent. is a clear profit. In 1841, there was sold in the two districts of Madras and Chingleput, salt to the amount of 48,140*l.*, and in 1850, the quantity sold had gradually risen to the value of 74,980*l.* The whole original cost of the road, and the subsequent repairs, had been 142,300*l.*, but the average annual gain in the increased sales of salt had been between the two years specified, above 14,226*l.*, a gross return from salt alone of nearly 10 per cent. on the outlay.

Works of irrigation and roads offer the most extensive and important as well as the most obvious means of improving the productive powers of the country, and the condition of the people, at the same time that the money laid out upon them may be expected to yield a fair remuneration even in a mercantile point of view. If they have been neglected, or but slightly attended to, it is not surprising that a similar and greater neglect has been shown towards the creation of internal navigation by canals, or to the preservation and improvement

of harbours. On both coasts of the Peninsula, but more especially on the western, there are backwaters or lagoons at the embouchure of rivers, which extend inland to a considerable distance, and are valuable as means of communication with the coast. In some instances, there are facilities for joining these waters by canals and cuts, and thus creating a lengthened internal navigation. The following extract, which refers to some improvements in the back waters of Malabar, will perhaps sufficiently explain both the nature of such works, and the manner in which their utility may be regarded: —

'The cuts were three in number, to the aggregate length of twenty-one miles, and at a total cost of 29.904 rupees (2,990*l.*). Though their whole length is so little, yet with the intervening backwaters they form a connected navigation ninety miles in length. These works were sanctioned during Lord Tweeddale's government, and besides greatly promoting trade and intercourse in general, they are of great importance to the district in facilitating the transport of grain from the southern talooks to those in the north, the staple of which latter is pepper. The canals are very narrow, and sufficient only for the small boats in use; but it will, no doubt, be most advisable to improve them eventually for steam navigation. It was a part of the original design to unite in one continued navigation the backwaters of Malabar, Cochin, and Travancore, from Baragherry to Quilon, a distance of above 200 miles; and the project for this purpose was sent in by the Board of Revenue for the approval of the present Government. It consisted of the cutting of a canal and the improvement of a backwater, for a distance of fifteen miles, involving an expense of 8.995 rupees (900*l.*); but the Right Honourable the Governor in Council saw "no sufficient "reason for incurring the expense." He was also "of opinion that "the time and attention of the civil engineer should not be called "off from more important works by projects of this character."'

Harbours have naturally had little care taken of them, especially as the machinery for doing so has been in a great measure wanting. Of the fifty-seven places at which port-dues are levied in the Madras Presidency, there is one, the port of Coringa, which deserves special notice. It is, after Madras, the most important, and is, more than Madras, capable of improvement at a moderate cost. Its situation at the mouth of the great river Godavery is a favourable one; and had it happened in earlier days that the seat of government had been fixed on this spot, and that our territories had extended inland from this place, instead of over the extreme south, the Southern Presidency would probably, ere now, have emulated Calcutta in the extent and value of its commerce. For 700 miles the Godavery and the Wurdah penetrate inland to the rich cotton

districts of Berar. The river has been navigated in former days, for a great part of that distance, by the boats of a European firm now no longer existing; but the navigation is not now carried on, though it is understood that there are but five or six obstacles, and those easily removable. There is, however, an additional hindrance in the shape of vexatious transit duties levied by the native chiefs through whose lands the river runs.

The physical obstacles will, it may be hoped, before long cease to exist, as a project has been set on foot for the purpose, and it is probable that negotiation will effect the removal of the artificial hindrance of the transit duties. The British Government has now an additional interest in improving the navigation of these noble streams, as the newly assigned districts of Berar, received from the Nizam, communicate directly with them. The cotton districts of Berar furnish about sixty million pounds of cotton annually to the Bombay market. The cotton is conveyed on pack-bullocks, and the various marts, at which it is purchased, are from 216 to 450 miles from Bombay. During that long transit it is exposed to numberless causes of loss and injury. The cost of transport from the nearest mart was stated, by a Committee which sat at Bombay in 1847, at 66 per cent. of the prime cost. Fifty out of that sixty-six will, it is calculated, be saved, if the attempt to open the navigation of the Godavery and the Wurdah is successful, or, to state the result in money, the cotton, which, on its arrival at Bombay, now costs 166*l.*, will be delivered at another port, that of Coringa, for 116*l.* or 117*l.* Here would be a ready solution of the problem which has engaged so much attention, the mode of increasing the quantity of cotton imported into England, and it is almost superfluous to point out that a stimulus would be applied, not only to the production of that one article, but to every branch of trade which so great an extent of rich country is capable of maintaining.

Enough has been said of the public works of the Madras territories to show that that country possesses capabilities for improvement to an extent which, in a country that has been inhabited for centuries, is as remarkable as those of the Western States of North America. An annual return of nearly 70 per cent. has been yielded by the aggregate of new works of irrigation constructed by the British Government. Even a new road has been productive as a mere investment of capital. By the side of this result, it is not a little remarkable that those districts which have not profited by the recent outlay on public works have been, as nearly as may be, stationary during the last thirty years. They declined until 1838, when a commis-

sion was appointed to inquire into the causes of the general falling off of revenue at Madras. They have again in some degree advanced since that period; and the abolition of the transit duties in 1843 had a marked effect in reducing the annual arrears of land revenue. Throughout the agricultural districts the rate of interest may be stated at not less than 12 per cent.,—a rate which indicates how high must be the usual profit on capital properly employed. The wages of labour are extremely low, and there is a vast area of uncultivated land, equal in extent to what is now cultivated, and which is capable of being profitably occupied. The Courts of Law may be doubtless susceptible of improvement, but insecurity of property is not one of the causes which can be assigned in answer to the question which the facts we have stated suggest, Why private capital is not largely employed in so large and profitable a field? The cultivators of the South of India are generally an industrious race, and energetic compared with the peasant of Bengal, in which country so great an extent of land has within the last sixty years been rescued from the domain of the tiger and the buffalo. The obstacle, therefore, lies not in the personal deficiencies of the cultivator, but in the circumstances in which he is placed. He pays from 30 to 40 per cent. of the gross produce as land revenue to Government, and, in addition to this, his normal condition is to be in debt. A bad season, or the religious duty of marrying his children, and the social one of spending on the ceremony much more than he can afford, lays the foundation of the debt, and he finds its extinction a much less easy process. He cultivates as much land as he can conveniently occupy, but he would readily cultivate more if he could get it for nothing, and thus gain an increased proportion of the produce of the whole for himself. But, under the present system, for every additional acre he must pay the due assessment. There is nothing in his circumstances to excite him to extra exertion, or to increased cultivation, unless some new road or work of irrigation confers an additional value on his share of the crop.

There is therefore a general tendency to a stationary condition, which is the direct effect of the Ryotwar system. This system, divested of all adventitious practices and rules, which may vary materially in different places, has for its fundamental principle that each cultivator shall pay the land revenue assessed on the land which he occupies, and nothing more, and that he shall pay it direct to the Government. As regards the lands in actual cultivation, the system may be considered perfect in theory. He has the power of diminishing or increasing his

farms, is not subject to any superior, and is called on to pay no extra cesses. The collector of the district superintends the land revenue; and the cultivator has every year an opportunity of meeting him in person, and of making known to him his wants or his grievances, whether as an individual, or in company with his fellow-villagers. In practice, however, the system breaks down, first, from the immense size of some of the districts,—of that of Bellary, for instance, which contains more than 13,000 square miles, and 1,200,000 souls, in which the collector is expected to perform duties too extensive for one man. This is a fault which can be and ought to be removed. A still greater practical defect in the present arrangements is, that in no part of the Madras territories has a survey and assessment been executed. The consequence is, that the present assessment is not only extremely unequal, but that its amount is often a standing reproach. No better instance of its inequality can be adduced than that in Tanjore, which has an almost unfailing supply of water for irrigation, tolerably good roads, and the sea close at hand for exporting produce, an acre of rice land pays $4\frac{3}{4}$ rupees of land revenue; while in Cuddapah, far inland, and with no made road whatever, the same extent of land averages $8\frac{1}{4}$ rupees. The excessive amount occasionally charged on land may be exemplified by the fact that there are great plains in the Bellary country consisting of first-class land, which are lying waste in consequence of the assessment being more than proportionately high upon land of that class, and second-class land being therefore preferred. In like manner, in the sub-collectorate of Salem, a large quantity of the best land is out of cultivation for the same reason.

Two measures, the diminution of overgrown collectorates, and the execution of a general survey and assessment, would remove the chief practical difficulties which encumber the operation of the Ryotwar system, as regards lands actually in cultivation. But there yet remains to be mentioned one fundamental defect of that system, as it affects land which is not in cultivation. The cultivable waste land has remained unoccupied from year to year, and appears likely to continue so for an indefinite length of time. It yields, and is likely to yield, neither crop to the husbandman nor revenue to the Government; and it would be no loss to the latter, if, content with the existing land revenue, it made a present to the cultivator of this dormant fund, and allowed him to use it without additional payment. It is by an arrangement of this description that cultivation has so much advanced in the Presidencies of Bengal and Agra. A fixed amount of revenue has been there assessed, whether in

perpetuity or for a term of years; and whatever fresh land can be brought into cultivation is so much clear gain to the person or community with whom the settlement has been made. The resources from which the assessment is to be paid are increased by every additional acre, whether by the simple receipt of more rent, in the case of an individual; or, in that of a community, by spreading the whole over a wider surface, and lightening the share of each individual. There is thus always residing on the spot a direct interest to clear and break up, and let out waste land for cultivation. It is by such a process that the great increase of the revenues of Bengal since 1792 has been caused,—an increase which has shown itself, not in that portion which is derived from land, but in all the other subordinate branches of the public income. In Madras, on the contrary, every acre of newly occupied land pays eventually the same assessment as the old farms; and no increase of cultivation lightens the burdens on the neighbouring lands. No one, therefore, is interested in increasing the cultivation, and no man's payment is lessened by it.

There is one concomitant of the Ryotwar system which, perhaps more than any other, has unconsciously biassed in its favour the officers who have directed its operations; this is, that the cultivator, whether rich or poor, when once he has paid his assessment, is comparatively independent of all the world: whereas, under the native system which preceded it, he was subject to numberless oppressions and exactions; and something of this nature may probably, in some degree, exist wherever a middleman is interposed, and where the poorer cultivators are not placed in direct communication with the British revenue officers. It is not improbable but that some method may be found of conciliating these two great interests,—the social independence of the cultivator, and the means of using that large extent of fertile land which has for so many years lain waste and useless. In order to effect this, to consider the principles on which a survey should be conducted, and the objects to which it should be directed, and to dispose of the many important questions concerning land which would arise in the course of such an inquiry, it is essential that a Commission should be appointed; and it will form an era in the internal history of Madras, if its labours should produce as marked an effect on the various interests connected with the land, as the Report on Public Works is likely eventually to do on the whole of that department.

The question which, for the improvement of the country, is the greatest and most extensive in all its bearings, is that of

land revenue, and a proper adjustment of it would of itself give a general stimulus to cultivation. Next in consequence, and auxiliary to it, is the organisation of the department of Public Works, whose importance has hitherto been so little recognised that there is no authority whose separate and special task it is to superintend them. The persons who execute works are generally the same. But for superintendence, the military works and buildings are under one authority; the judicial, such as gaols, under another; some of the trunk roads under a third, and the remainder of the roads, and the whole of the works of irrigation, under a fourth. This last is the Board of Revenue, already fully employed by the important and pressing business from which it takes its name. It has, in fact, been unable to serve two masters; and the Public Works, which ought to receive undivided attention, have been the least important part of its charge. With an inadequate office establishment, meagrely increased to meet the increased demands upon it caused by the correspondence being in 1850 nine times as great, and the expenditure nearly double what it was in 1836, it was scarcely possible that the business should be carried on in the way such important interests demand. The current work has been kept under, but there has been no time for a general view of things, no careful collection of statistics, no comparison of the present with the former state of works, of the wants of the works of one district, or of the operations of one engineer with those of another, no statement of the result of works from which inferences affecting future operations should be drawn, no general plan of roads, while several fundamental questions, such as what class of road should be constructed for different amounts of traffic, have not been settled. The obvious and effectual remedy for this state of things is that recommended by the Commissioners—to establish a Board of Works, and to place under their management, guided by a well-considered system of rules, the whole of the buildings and works of irrigation, the canals, roads, and harbours of the country. Such a Board will give its undivided attention to the great interests committed to its charge, and will have it in its power to remedy all the defects we have pointed out. It will, moreover, be governed by system instead of by accidents,—by a system of forethought and supervision, in place of one regulated by the accidental activity of a collector or an engineer, or whatever the circumstances may be, which have led to the somewhat discreditable inequality which now exists, in the neglect of the roads of one district and the attention paid to those of another.

It will, moreover, not be sufficient merely to remodel the chief authority. The *personnel* of the department requires to

be improved. How much this is wanted a few words will explain. The area of the Madras territory is upwards of 138,000 square miles. There are twenty collectorates, of which fourteen may be termed irrigation districts. The collectorates vary in size from 13,000 to 3000 square miles. They are subdivided into *talooks*, of which there are altogether 256, and which average more than 500 square miles. Over each talook is placed an officer called a *tehsildar*, who is subordinate to the collector, and carries on the revenue and police duties of his circle. He has also the charge of all public works which are not for military purposes. Under his authority emergent repairs are executed, while, for ordinary repairs of works of moderate importance, he frames estimates, forwards them to the collector, and executes them when orders have been received. His chief instrument in framing such estimates is a subordinate native officer called a Maistry. There is one of these officers on an average in every two and a half talooks, whose range may comprise a thousand works of all sorts, besides several hundreds of miles of roads. It is his business to be acquainted with all these works, to visit them successively, especially those which are reported as requiring repair, to frame estimates, and, on works of a certain magnitude, to superintend their execution. To fit the Maistry for these duties there is no place of instruction open to him, nor is any care taken that a class of such importance should be specially educated. The consequence is not only that useless men are retained in such situations, because no better substitutes are to be found, but that they are declared to be generally incompetent, and 'no better than common bricklayers,' whereas, if properly qualified, the Maistry would be most useful, both from the work he would himself perform, and from the check he would be on the tehsildar and his subordinates.

For superintending the execution of works of considerable magnitude, it is usual to appoint an European overseer, drawn from the ranks of the British regiments, or a commissioned officer. The overseer, when so appointed, belongs to the department, and his services have been found invaluable, but neither for him is there any mode of obtaining such scientific and practical instruction as would double their value.

The civil engineer (an officer of the military Corps of Engineers) has properly no concern in the execution of work. His duties are to visit in person every part of his circle, to report to the collector the general state of works, to examine and estimate for those of considerable magnitude which are in want of repair, to project new works, to examine work which has been executed, and to check and test the expenditure. He has an office establishment, for the members of which also, with one exception,

no instruction is provided*, and the exception is but an insignificant one in favour of the class of assistant surveyors, usually East Indians, of whom five or six are to a certain extent taught in a room of the Board of Revenue office at Madras. The circle of a civil engineer, the tract of country which he has to visit in person, comprises two collectorates, and when it is stated that some of these circles comprise 24,000, 20,900, and 16,000 square miles, enough has been said to show that it is impossible for one man to execute the duties of his office efficiently. Some of the reforms called for in regard to the *personnel* of the department of Public Works are therefore sufficiently obvious; to place an engineer in each collectorate, and to provide an educational establishment for the special instruction of the three classes of subordinate officers to whom such important duties are intrusted. These measures would increase the expense of the permanent establishments, but it can scarcely be doubted that the power of doing work well instead of slurring it over, or altogether neglecting it, as is now necessarily done by the engineers, and the improved capacity for intelligent supervision and execution which would be created in the subordinate officers, would amply repay the mere money outlay, while it would make the difference to parts of the country which suffer under the present system, of their works of irrigation being perfected, and such roads as may

* There is one other place of instruction from which it strikes us that a very useful class of subordinate officers, supplemental to the Corps of Engineers, may eventually be drawn; we allude to the school recently established by Major Maitland in the Gun-carriage Manufactory at Madras, of which he is superintendent. The pupils are the apprentices of the Corps of Artificers, and are for the most part, if not exclusively, East Indians.

This is a class which is generally held very cheap in India; and a notion is prevalent, that with here and there an individual exception, to look to its members for any considerable amount of either physical or intellectual service is utterly vain. Major Maitland's experiment, which has been carried out mainly at his own private expense, and entirely by his own disinterested zeal, has gone far to prove that there is neither bodily nor mental incapacity inherent in the East Indian race; that the defects usually found in them are the results of languid and effeminate bringing up; and that a vigorous and hardy training such as he gives them, regular in system, strict in discipline, and combining practical handicraft with theoretical science and general knowledge, can make out of this despised material an active, intelligent, and well-informed class of public servants. Major Maitland's school has, we believe, already supplied efficient assistant engineers to the Madras Railway Company. If properly organised as a public institution, we see no reason why it should not do the same for Government.

be formed being properly and expeditiously executed. We find in the Report several instances of considerable saving having been effected by the presence of European overseers in supervising work, and there seems no room to doubt that had those men, and all the other subordinate officers employed in the department, received a more complete course of instruction, the result would have been a general economising of the expenditure.

There is yet one subject of considerable importance to be adverted to, which concerns not only the Government of Madras, but also the two authorities to which it is subordinate. The presidency of Madras, under the financial arrangements which now prevail, is expected to pay its own expenses, and to contribute 500,000*l.* towards the home remittance. It is therefore of importance to know what its expenses are. The heaviest item is the military. The Madras army garrisons the territories properly belonging to Madras. It also occupies Mysore, whose Government by treaty pays to that of Madras a fixed sum which meets the expenditure; and the Nizam's country, in payment of which a sufficient territory was long ago ceded by that prince. But in addition to these services, for which the Madras treasury is reimbursed, there are others for which it receives no payment. The Southern Mahratta country, whose revenues belong to Bombay, the Saugur and Nerbudda territories, Cuttack and Nagpore, Tenasserim, and now Pegu, whose revenues or payments go to Bengal or Agra, are all occupied by Madras troops; and a considerable expense on account of Aden also falls on Madras. In calculating the proper expenses of that presidency, those incurred on account of countries foreign to it ought to be deducted, and, in their place, a due share, if any such is due, of the expenses incurred on account of the general defence of our Indian empire, should be imposed.

It is also of consequence that a correct financial view should be taken of the annual expenditure on account of repairs of works of irrigation. These repairs are now incorrectly assumed to be expended out of the net revenue. They are in fact necessary conditions for the production of any permanent revenue from irrigated lands, and should be deducted from the gross land revenue, the net land revenue being that which remains after deducting them. They are similar in nature to the repairs of a steam engine or of a dwelling house; and no house proprietor would be considered in his proper senses if he calculated his income from a house he had let to be the gross receipts, and did not make an allowance for common periodical repairs. They resemble the expenses of the repair of farm buildings on an English estate, which form a deduction from the gross income.

What is desirable under an efficient Board of Works is to place every existing work of irrigation in the best repair, as being the plan which is at once the most economical and efficient. The experience of a few years will establish the percentage of casualties and common repairs which are yearly required, and a fixed sum, revisable from time to time, should be annually allowed for the purpose as a deduction from the gross land revenue. An additional sum should be fixed as the yearly expenditure on new works, and anything beyond this should be the subject of a special application to the Government of India. This is a question of detail, but it is not unimportant. The present system of requiring a separate application from the subordinate governments for permission from the Government of India to undertake any work which is to cost 1000*l.*, is open to serious objection. It causes disgusts and heart-burnings, whether from its being felt to be a continual reminder of want of confidence, or from an unreasonable desire of not being subjected to any superior so near at hand, or from the occasional refusals which are met with. As regards Madras, indeed, such refusals have been very limited in number; the whole during the last ten years being 8 in 134 proposals, or just 6 per cent.

The object to be borne in mind in devising arrangements of this nature is, to combine the requisite control on the one hand with the greatest practicable liberty of action in the party controlled. Between the Board of Works and its own government, and between the subordinate and superior governments, the same system should prevail, of sending a yearly estimate describing, in anticipation, the plans to be carried out in the ensuing year, and a yearly report stating what had been executed in accordance with the estimate previously sent, and with the orders passed upon it. Under such a system there will be a sufficient power of check and control, and, in comparison with the present, there will be more free action. Under such a system it would have been equally impossible to have neglected to assign the ferry funds for the repair of roads, or to take proper steps towards expending the fund which the Court of Directors lately allotted to the road department.

In the course of our remarks we have indicated how wide is the field for internal improvement in Southern India. It is with reference to the possibility of such improvements being attempted that we look upon it as nothing short of essential that whoever is selected as Governor of Madras should be versed in the details of Indian administration, and be also capable of statesmanlike views, and that on that or some other field of action he shall have shown himself to be equal to the duties which rightly belong to that important office. Above all things

he should not be a mere name. The Madras Government, in the person of its European revenue officers, is brought every year into direct contact with every member of the agricultural class, and how numerous a body that is may be inferred from the fact that in Tanjore alone they are 140,000. This extensive ramification of its agency enables it to influence for good or for evil the fate of vast bodies of peaceable and industrious men. On the correct solution of some of the vital questions which we have indicated depends the manner in which the most important matters affecting their prosperity and advancement shall be regulated, and it is not therefore too much to say that there are few men to whom it is given to have such power of benefiting his fellow creatures as is intrusted to a Governor of Madras.*

---

* The subjoined statement exhibits the revenue derived from miscellaneous sources, exclusive of land, in the Bengal Presidency in 1792-3 and in 1850-1. The more recent acquisitions of that Presidency have been omitted from both columns. Since 1792-3 the events principally affecting these branches of revenue have been the imposition of stamp duties, the abolition of internal transit duties, and the increase of the consumption of opium in China. The gross revenue from these sources, in round numbers, has risen in the interval from a million sterling to five millions; the net revenue from 800,000*l.* to 3½ millions. A certain influence in producing this result is unquestionably due to each of the changes which we have mentioned, more especially to the increased demand for opium; but these events could only supply favourable circumstances, and the elasticity and power to take advantage of them is due to the limitation of the land revenue. This circumstance is altogether wanting in Madras, and it will accordingly be found that no corresponding increase has taken place there.

| | Gross Receipts. | |
|---|---|---|
| | 1792-3. | 1850-1. |
| Stamps - - - | - - - | 20.51.673 9 9 |
| Abkaree - - - | 2.16.214 6 3 | 28.62.405 6 2 |
| Sayer - - - | 1.94.671 6 3 | 4.15.810 2 9 |
| Customs - - - | 7.27.056 11 9 | 1.01.36.389 15 8 |
| Salt - - - | 72.02.769 0 0 | 97.49.559 0 0 |
| Opium - - - | 25.92.940 0 0 | 2.59.71.000 0 0 |
| Total Co.'s rupees - | 1.09.33.651 8 3 | 5.12.36.838 2 4 |
| Charges - - - | 28.14.988 10 4 | 1.59.50.447 6 1 |
| Net Receipts - - | 81.18.662 3 11 | 3.52.76.390 12 3 |

ART. V. — 1. *A Bill for the Promotion of Education in Cities and Boroughs in England, prepared and brought in by Lord John Russell and Mr. Secretary-at-War.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed 7th April, 1853.

2. *Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education,* 1852–3. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty. London: 1853.

3. *A Bill intituled 'An Act for the better Administration of 'Charitable Trusts.'* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed. 1st July, 1853.

4. *Report and Evidence upon the Recommendations of Her Majesty's Commissioners for Inquiring into the State of the University of Oxford.* Presented to the Board of Heads of Houses and Proctors, December 1. 1853. Oxford: at the University Press. 1853.

THE urgent necessities of public business made it impossible for Parliament to consider last Session the Government Education Bill, which we have placed first in our list at the head of this Article. This delay need not, however, be regretted, if, as we trust will be the case, the measure be in consequence made more comprehensive, and if, by the time thus given for consideration, the public becomes more fully awake to the existence of evils which cry aloud for a remedy, and to the absolute necessity for meeting these evils in a practical way in spite of all difficulties.

Of course reasonable objections may be made to the system of an education-rate as embodied in this Bill, and to the necessary compromise as to full religious instruction which a rate seems to entail; but, what every man who loves his country is at this time bound to consider, is, not what objections can be raised to the scheme proposed, but whether, amidst the many objections to which every scheme is liable, the scheme now brought forward be liable to the fewest, and whether the overwhelming weight of objections does not lie against proposing no general measure at all. To our minds the case as to the education of the poor presents only these three alternatives: either, 1st, no general measure of education for them at all; or, 2ndly, a measure of mere secular, ignoring religious teaching, and therefore very faintly recognising the thousands of schools founded on religious principles which already exist and flourish; or, 3rdly, some such measure as that proposed by Govern-

ment, based upon the well-approved system of the Committee of Council, and endeavouring to enlist the sympathies of the community generally in the maintenance and efficient working of all the schools which the Christian benevolence and zeal of the several religious bodies have already founded or shall hereafter found. We believe that the third of these alternatives is cordially embraced by an overwhelming majority in the country. The only disagreement or doubt refers to matters of detail, on which the time allowed for further consideration and discussion, bringing out more clearly the absolute necessity for mutual concession, will probably lead earnest-minded men of various parties to more complete agreement, before the proposed measure appears in Parliament.

Meanwhile it may be useful if we try quietly to review the position in which the great Education Question now stands. We shall probably find that it has made marked progress, and yet that there is a very wide field still almost untrodden.

We say the *great* Education Question; for we cordially agree in the propriety of that extension of the question which Lord John Russell introduced in his opening speech of April 4. The elementary education of the children of the poor, on which so much attention and energy has hitherto been concentrated, is not the education of the nation. A Ministry really alive to the importance of a thorough national education will think both of rich and poor. Therefore we hold that Lord John Russell was bound to introduce into his speech all those three elements, which many thought it unwise, while all allowed that it was unusual, to combine. A really national system of education must reach the middle and upper classes as well as the poor. Aristocratic Fellows of All Souls, and honourable members who are now Life Guardsmen and have been Gentleman-Commoners of Christ Church, felt themselves somewhat insulted when they heard the reform of the learned body, of which they are distinguished ornaments, mixed up with measures for the better regulation of parish schools, and discussions as to the proportion in which such schools ought to be made dependent on the children's pence; while the governors of our great Public Schools would be shocked at hearing their ancient and dignified Institutions spoken of in the same breath with the whole herd of little grammar schools and other eleemosynary foundations for educating tradesmen's and ploughmen's sons. But the fact is that the time has come when the education of the poor, imperfectly developed as it is, has already made such progress that it has become absolutely necessary for Government to attend to the education of the rich. We should certainly have in a very

few years a complete overturn of social order — 'now servant 'is master, and master is man' — if, when the son of any poor labourer in a common parish school may attain such knowledge as the pupil teachers of any well-regulated village now possess, the squire's son were to be allowed unmolested to enter on the quiet possession of his acres, and stand for the representation of his county in Parliament, with that scanty modicum of misunderstood Latin grammar, and Horace committed most imperfectly to memory without being construed, which we fear is sometimes still dignified with the name of education. We are confident that there are many sets of freshmen at present in our universities who know less of arithmetic, history, geography, and, above all, of the Bible, than the first class of the parish school frequented by the children of their fathers' gamekeepers. Moreover the middle schools frequented by the children of small tradesmen and farmers are notoriously much less efficient than our lower schools. It could not be sound policy, while we greatly improve the education of the children of the poor, to allow that of the higher classes to remain stationary.

Perhaps there is no more important feature in the state of the Education Question, as it now stands before the public, than the growing conviction of the necessity for Government directing its attention to the education of the middle and upper classes. The Charitable Trusts Bill has now become law. There is good reason to hope that, through the operation of this Act, many years will not elapse before the sum of 152,047*l.* per annum, at which the income of the endowed grammar schools is calculated*, together with a fair proportion of the rest of that half million at which Lord Brougham has calculated the annual income of the endowments for education throughout the land†, has been made available for furnishing every locality with a really good middle school. And, moreover, the Duke of Wellington's examinations for all young men who aspire to bear Her Majesty's commission in the army, the clause in the Government India Bill throwing open writerships and the higher cadetships to public competition, and Lord John Russell's warning to the Universities that they have only been spared for a time from Parliamentary reform on the express condition of their labouring to reform themselves — all these are indications that the Education Question is now understood to extend far beyond the schools for the lower orders.

And now, in the interval which the postponement of the

---

* Sir J. K. Shuttleworth's Public Education, &c., p. 223.

† Ibid. p. 224.

Government Education Bill and the time granted to the Universities allow, we propose to dedicate a few pages to the consideration of some points which we think it would be well to have very seriously considered before the Education Question is again taken up in Parliament.

Following in Lord John Russell's track, we cannot separate the education of the middle and upper from that of the lower classes. Not only must the improvement of all three go hand in hand, if social order is to be preserved; but, in a country so free as ours, where no impassable gulph separates one class from another, the whole body politic must be cemented together, and mutual good feeling must be kept alive by opening easy means of transition for the promising youth of one class to rise into another. Our fathers, in old days, so far as they understood the wants of society, endeavoured in some measure to attain this object. They did not, it is true, think much of the serf-like population of the lowest class; but, through grammar-schools and exhibitions, they tried to unite the middle with the highest class.

The following extract from Mr. Tremenheere's recent 'Notes 'on Public Subjects in the United States and Canada' (p. 253.) shows how this important point is attended to by our Canadian fellow-countrymen. The old country is not, we trust, too self-sufficient to be willing to learn from the young.

'In Canada the public grammar-schools, established by an 'amended Act of 1819, provide a higher education for all who 'desire it, and are an appropriate supplement to the system of 'elementary schools. The Act contemplates these schools being 'set on foot in every district in the province.

'By section 6., ten children may be sent to them by the 'trustees, to be taught gratis, selected from the most promising 'pupils in the common schools. By a provision in the Munici-'cipal Law of 1849, power is given to the county councils to 'defray the expense of sending to the college or to the univer-'sity as many of the pupils of the different public grammar-'schools as shall be deserving, and as, in the opinion of the 'respective masters, shall be of competent attainments for 'entering into competition for any of the scholarships, exhi-'bitions, or other similar prizes offered by the university or 'college for competition among such pupils, their parents being 'unable to bear the expense.'

It is of great importance that we should have amongst ourselves some similar connexion between all our establishments for education, from the lowest to the highest.

Viewing the subject then thus widely, we begin by fully

acknowledging that Lord John Russell deserves the warm thanks of his country for the efforts he has made to spread sound education in every class. But he would himself be the last to maintain that the progress which he hopes to make by the Bills already introduced into Parliament, and the speeches he has already delivered, is to be acquiesced in as sufficient. One of the best points in his labours is the establishment of a system, which will probably greatly extend itself year after year. Great evils cannot be remedied at once: what a wise statesman proposes to himself, when he takes in hand the task of remedying them, will be, to construct the proper machinery and set it in motion, and to look forward to great results as it continues working, though these results may not come till after his own day.

Our object in the present Article is to note some of the points in which our Educational Reform, however it has advanced, is still behind the wants of the age, in its relation to the lower, the middle, and the upper classes. We believe that in each of these departments, even where the deficiency is at present most appalling, Government has taken the first steps towards improvement; but it is wrong to give the impression that there is not much which is amiss still left untouched. We now write in the hope that the plans already auspiciously undertaken may, year by year, be enlarged, and that this great work may prosper more and more in the hands which are engaged in it.

There seems every prospect, with the measures now proposed, that the education of the industrious poor, both in town and country, will soon be thoroughly attended to. The adoption by the Committee of Council of the minutes of 2nd April last, by which greater facilities are given for the erection and maintenance of schools in rural districts, the increase in the number of Inspectors, and the further adoption of the Supplementary Minutes of the 20th of August last with regard to Queen's scholars and certificated teachers, are very important steps in themselves, even independently of the other measures contemplated in the Charitable Trusts Act and the Education Bill. We believe that, henceforward, the chief deficiencies in our educational machinery, which it will be most difficult to remedy, will be found to lie below and above the industrious poor.

What we would now urge, therefore, is the necessity for effectual measures being taken: —

1st. To extend education to the lowest — the destitute and degraded classes:

2nd. To infuse life into the education of the middle class:

3rd. To secure that that thorough reform of the educational

establishments of the higher classes — the Universities and public schools — which the nation imperatively demands, be not frustrated or delayed by the timidity or ignorance, or self-interest, of any persons entrusted with the ordinary administration of these great establishments.

I. And first of the lowest poor. The progress already made is encouraging: 17,015 Church-of-England schools for the poor already working — 1,500 schools of the British and Foreign School Society, besides a fair proportion for the sects* — new schools also rising on every side — and fresh facilities afforded by the Privy Council for building and supporting new schools, as well as adding greatly to the usefulness of the old — all this gives a cheering prospect. We really need not now despair that in a few years all the children of our respectable poor, both in town and country, may have their education well provided for. With regard to these there is no need for any Prussian state-drilling, forcing the children to be taught. We may trust to the spread of right feeling, through the influence of Government schools, which, as their influence is more and more felt, will year by year stir up more of a generous rivalry, and love of sound instruction both amongst parents and children. And all this has a fair prospect of being effected, without any sacrifice of religious principle, by the exertions of the various religious communions, each aided by the State in its efforts to give education according to its conscientious views of what is the best mode of training a Christian child. Lord John Russell may well congratulate himself on the part he has borne in the measures which, since 1839, have produced such good fruit, and which give so rich a promise of much more abundant increase.

But the millions of the respectable poor, whose wants, it is granted, the system of popular education now fairly launched may be expected before many years to meet, are by no means all the poor. We may divide the people of any country in such a state of civilisation as ours, into four classes — the rich — the comfortable — the poor — and the perishing. Sir J. K. Shuttleworth is hardly right†, we think, in calling the classes, the neglect of whose education produces so many social evils, the industrious poor. From want of education individuals and families may sink from the industrious classes to the perishing; but the industrious classes are not usually the parents of crime and misery, and the ignorance that spreads ruin. The perishing

* See Lord John Russell's Speech, April 4. 1853.

† Public Education, p. 46.

are a very large class amongst us: and it is very doubtful whether our educational efforts have as yet made any permanent impression upon this class. The ragged schools, it is true, have neither been idle nor useless. But we have heard the system of ragged schools well described by one of their most zealous and talented supporters, as the working of the pump to keep out of the hold the water which must otherwise sink our vessel. Ragged schools are a temporary expedient to meet a sudden emergency: we cannot do without them; but it would be much better to find some regular system by which the hold could be made perfectly water-tight.

Doubtless, our present schools for the poor, frequented principally by the children of the respectable poor, may be expected in time to work downwards. If a good system is persevered in, they will gradually gain the power to attract and elevate many poor children who are at present outcasts. Sound political economy, as well as sound religion, leads us to expect that the perishing class may gradually be diminished — that at last it may even entirely disappear. The poor whom the Scriptures intimate God intended should never perish out of the land — who will always divide it with the comfortable and the rich — are not the perishing class. There is nothing degrading in that poverty which God's providence seems, by a rule never to be departed from, to have assigned as the lot of the overwhelming majority of the human family in all stages of civilisation. And we may hope that the degraded poverty of the perishing class will in time be almost, if not entirely, absorbed, by general good government, and good financial measures, and the spread of better and more Christian principles through all ranks. But this happy consummation is as yet very far distant. We have now an overwhelming class of outcasts at the bottom of society, whom our present system of popular education has not as yet reached — who are below the influence of our religious ordinances — and scarcely operated on by any wholesome restraints of public opinion. It is certain that such a class is found at present in all the civilised countries of Europe. Nay, the same evil presses hard on our younger brethren of the United States, whom we usually regard as so much happier in this respect than ourselves. Nowhere shall we find more vivid pictures of the misery of such a class than in a New England writer*, and we have all heard of the ex-

* Theodore Parker's Speeches, &c. Boston, 1852. Vol. i. p. 135, 136.

cellence of the New England schools. Witness the following extracts which teach a lesson for our own towns:—

'Let us look and see how we have disposed of the little ones 'in Boston,—what we are doing for them or with them. Let 'me begin with neglected and abandoned children. We all 'know how large and beautiful a provision is made for the edu- 'cation of the people. About a fourth part of the city taxes 'are for the public schools. Yet, one not familiar with this 'place is astonished at the number of idle vagrant boys and 'girls in the streets. It appears from the late census of 'Boston, that there are 4948 children between four and fifteen 'who attend no school. I am not speaking of truants, oc- 'casional absentees, but of children whose names are not re- 'gistered at school, permanent absentees. If we allow that '1948 of these are kept in some sort of restraint by their 'parents, and have, or have had, some little pains taken with 'their culture . . . . . there still remain 3000 children who 'never attend any school, turned loose into your streets. 'Suppose there is some error in the counting, that the number 'is overstated one third, still there are left 2000 young vagrants 'in the streets of Boston. . . . . What have these abandoned 'children to help them? Nothing, literally nothing. They 'are idle, though their bodies crave activity. They are poor, 'ill clad and ill fed. There is nothing about them to foster 'self-respect: nothing to call forth their conscience, to awaken 'and cultivate their sense of religion. They find themselves 'beggars in the wealth of a city; idlers in the midst of its 'work. Yes, savages in the midst of its civilisation. . . . . 'If you could know the life of one of these poor lepers of 'Boston, you would wonder and weep. He was born un- 'welcome amid wretchedness and want. His coming increased 'both. Miserably he struggles through his infancy, less tended 'than the lion's whelp. He becomes a boy, he is covered only 'with rags, and these squalid with long accumulated filth. He 'wanders about your streets too low even to seek employment; 'now snatching from the gutter half-rotten fruit, which the 'owner flings away. He is ignorant: he has never entered a 'school-house: to him even the alphabet is a mystery.'

Again, addressing the Teachers' Institute, at Syracuse, New York, the same writer says:—

'The children of most parents are easily brought to school 'by a little diligence on the part of the teachers and school 'committee; but there are also children of low and abandoned, 'or at least neglected parents, who live in a state of continual 'truancy: they are found on the banks of your canals, they

'swarm in your large cities. When these children become 'men . . . . . they remain dwarfs, and are barbarians in the 'midst of society.'*

This Republican writer proceeds in a passage which shows none of our English squeamishness lest we infringe the parent's liberty to do his child a great wrong, and which might have served as the peroration of Lord Shaftesbury's speech on this subject, in the House of Lords:—

'If a man abandons the body of his child, the State adopts 'that body for a time, takes the guardianship thereof for the 'child's own sake, sees that it is housed, fed, clad and cared 'for. If a man abandons his child's spirit, and the child commits 'a crime, the State, for its own sake, assumes the temporary 'guardianship thereof, and puts him in jail. When a man 'deserts his child, taking no concern about his education, I 'venture to make the suggestion, whether it would not be well, 'as the last resort, for the State to assume the guardianship of 'the child for its own sake, and for the child's sake. We allow 'no one with ever so thick a skin to grow up in nakedness. 'Why should we allow a child with ever so perverse a parent 'to grow up in ignorance and degenerate into crime? Cer-'tainly, a naked man is not so dangerous to society as an 'ignorant man, nor is the spectacle so revolting.'

Then speaking of the Asylum for Juvenile Offenders, and the State Reform School, for 'lads who break the law,' he adds: 'Would it not be better to take one step more,—adopt them 'before they offended, and allow no child to grow up in the 'barbarism of ignorance? Has any man an unalienable right 'to live a savage in the midst of civilisation?'†

We heartily wish success to Lord Shaftesbury's attempt to introduce some such compulsion amongst the nomad hordes of wild children in the Metropolis, and we are glad to see his exertions extending from London to the provinces. It is right, however, to note that an evil similar to that of which we are now speaking spreads beyond the ragged class for which Lord Shaftesbury has so zealously laboured. Mr. Tramenheere has published the following statement, made to him by the Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education. A like statement might be made as to every town in Great Britain. 'Under the present state of things, our 'system does not reach the whole population in our manu-'facturing towns. The parents themselves neglect the edu-

* Theodore Parker's Speeches, &c., vol. i. p. 424.

† Ibid. p. 425.

'cation of their children, and the manufacturing companies 'sometimes evade the spirit of the law, which requires a 'certain amount of attendance at school of children under a 'certain age.'* Might not this pass for an extract from Mr. Horner's Report on the state of our own towns? We have preferred to give the above extracts from writings which speak of America, because they seem to show better than any purely English authority that, without some efforts such as have never yet been made amongst us, the evil is incurable.† We are led to regard public education in the New England States as reduced to a well-matured system, and very flourishing: most of the friends of popular education amongst ourselves would feel well pleased if they thought our system likely soon to be equally efficient; but we here see from New England testimony how little the real difficulties which oppose the spread of education in the lowest class can be met by the best arranged system of a perfectly voluntary education, while all parents are left free to refuse its blessings to their children if they will.

The Secretary to the Massachusetts Board continues, after deploring that so many children are deprived of education by their parents' fault:—

'It is not the special duty of the School Committees to cor-'rect this evil, and it will probably be necessary for the towns 'to appoint some person of influence or with more or less of 'legal authority to look after such children and bring them to 'school. A gentleman at Roxberry, Mr. Ritchie, employed 'by the city authorities, has made this experiment, and he has 'informed me that he has so far succeeded as to be of opinion 'that the attendance of all the children of school-age can be 'secured in this way by the appointment of an officer of this 'kind.'

In England, the clergyman of the parish and his district visitors do much in this way by persuasion; but mild persuasion is powerless against the greatness of the evil; and a grave question arises whether the time has not come when some legal authority must be given, not to persuade, but to command. It was, doubtless, from feeling the force of such arguments that Lord John Russell introduced the 28th clause into his Bill:—

---

* Notes on Public Subjects, &c., p. 44.

† We believe that an honest inquiry into the state of Education in the mining districts of Durham and Northumberland, for example, would disclose a frightful amount of neglect. We should be glad to see one of Her Majesty's inspectors give public circulation to some account of these districts in a short and easily accessible form.

'For the purpose of extending the benefits of education among 'the poor, the clerks to every Board of Guardians of any parish 'or union wholly or in part within any borough in which this Act 'shall be in operation, shall, at the end of each quarter of a year, 'or oftener if required by the School Committee, report in 'writing to the School Committee of such borough the names 'and places of abode of such poor children between the ages 'of four and twelve years, resident within the borough, as 'are not attending any school, and who themselves, or whose 'parents or guardians, are in the receipt of out-door relief; and 'the guardians of such parish or union may require such child 'to attend some school in such borough, subject to such rules 'and regulations as the Poor-Law Board shall issue in the 'matter, and during such attendance shall pay on his or her 'behalf at the rate of twopence per week, for his or her educa-'tion, to the managers, trustees, or proprietors of such school.'

Considering how very uncertain are the periods for which able-bodied persons with families usually receive outdoor relief, it may be doubted how far this clause will avail practically to meet the great evil complained of. And, again, Lord Shaftesbury's Bill for the prevention of juvenile mendicancy applied only to London. If good for London, its principle must be good for Manchester and Liverpool and every large town. Sir J. K. Shuttleworth has shown that, in Manchester and Salford, of the poor children between the ages of three and fifteen, amounting in all to somewhat less than 100,000, there are about 40,000 who are not at work, and yet receive no instruction.* No great progress has as yet been made in devising the best means to remedy this pressing evil. But something has been done if men are made to understand, that, in order to secure the education of the lowest class, it is not enough to establish and encourage good schools.

Another clause in Lord John Russell's Bill is very important as bearing on the state of the neglected poor:—'17. 'The School Committee of any borough may, from time to 'time, in accordance with regulations to be duly made by 'them and approved of by the Committee of Council, grant 'such sums as such School Committee may deem requisite 'towards the opening, and for such period as they shall de-'termine towards the support, of an evening school to be con-'ducted in any school in such borough admitted to the benefit 'of this Act.'

We should be glad to see a provision for encouraging evening

* Public Education, Appendix F., p. 475.

schools extended to the country districts. With all our efforts there must ever remain a great difficulty in securing for the children of the very poor such an amount of attendance at the day school as will make their education real. The claims of daily sustenance must be attended to. The children of the very poor cannot be made to go to a day-school except for a few years; and a great many of them, when they go to work, will soon forget all they have ever learned. Evening schools will enable instruction to be continued after their working life has begun, and any supposed hardship of compulsion would be much diminished if the alternative of an evening school be offered when parents cannot live without their children's help. We trust, therefore, that this clause in the Government Bill will not be overlooked, and that the principle it embodies will soon be extended in its application. We believe that much may be done by evening schools for a further and truer education of the very poor. But the whole question of the education of the lowest class requires to be very carefully considered, and to be made, as soon as possible the subject of specific legislation.

II. And now we turn to the education of the middle class. It is not to be expected that farmers and tradesmen should send their children to be the playfellows of the children of day-labourers in the parish schools. Great efforts may for a time overcome such scruples in some exceptional case, as has been proved by the Dean of Hereford at King's Somborne; but the middle, as well as the upper classes, know that the education which is suitable for the very poor will not meet their wants, and they have their own ideas of accustoming their children to keep up their position in society. Hence they are sure to look out for separate schools. We desire, therefore, to see a good middle school in every district, and we much fear that good schools of this class are at present very rare. Such schools are at present usually private speculations. Not unfrequently in our country towns a master or mistress whom the Government inspector has not found qualified to conduct a school for the poor, being obliged to resign as unfit, opens a private school for a higher class, which is immediately crowded. In this school, instruction is given according to antiquated methods; the enlightenment which has so changed the whole education of the poor is thus carefully excluded from the instruction of their superiors. The highest perfection of the middle-school scholar is often a copperplate-like handwriting, and an overburdened memory, to which the girls add very elegant worsted work, and the boys a very neat system of book-keeping. The

pupils' knowledge of the globe consists probably in a wonderful facility of going through the geography book by rote. If lessons in Religion have been given at all, they have probably been confined to a parrot-like repetition of such manuals as Watts's Scripture History; and for such very meagre instruction ten shillings a quarter at the least is paid — five or six times as much as may command a really good education in a lower school. But the farmer or tradesman would think he was doing his children an injustice, if he did not try to give them the peculiar advantage of a middle school. Often he will make a great sacrifice to board them at a distance from home, that they may have such advantages. Now, as the middle class is ready to pay for such schools, an effort ought certainly to be made to secure that they are good of their kind. We do not see that Government is called upon to give any money to aid in the establishment of such schools: the class whose wants are sought to be supplied are rich enough to pay for themselves; but it is much to be desired that Government should give the benefit of superintendence and advice. It would be well also if some system were devised by which certificates of fitness were given on examination to masters and mistresses for this class, that managers of such schools and parents might thus have some guide to the selection of proper teachers. The founders of our old grammar schools were in the habit of seeking such guidance by insisting on the necessity of the master having taken a University degree. We hardly know whether it be principally to the Government or the Church, or to whom, that the middle class are now to look for such assistance; but with their own limited education they are obviously not at present able, without extraneous aid, to establish in all localities a good system for themselves. They will have great reason to complain, and great social evils will be the result, if their children are allowed to remain under their present disadvantages.

There ought to be a thoroughly good middle school well taught and well looked after in every district. There are now scattered through the country forty training schools for schoolmasters and schoolmistresses under Government inspection (*vide* Sir J. K. Shuttleworth's Public Education, p. 107.). In some few cases, middle schools have been sought to be attached to these. We believe that the Committee of Council has hitherto felt some reluctance to sanction such union, though we do not, we confess, understand upon what ground. But, if the middle and training schools are not allowed to be closely connected, at least advantages might arise from their being placed in the same locality, that the approved staff which governs

and inspects the training school may, without inconvenience or any great expense, exercise some superintendence over the middle school.

We ask also what are the cathedrals doing in this matter? Has not each of them an ancient grammar school attached to it? This grammar school ought forthwith to be divided into two departments. In one let the old instruction in Latin and Greek be rigidly maintained; but let the other be ordered on the most improved principles of a modern middle school. What King Edward's School is for Birmingham — the great centre of its Christian civilisation — that the cathedral school ought to be in every diocese. Let the management of the cathedral schools be thoroughly investigated; let their system of instruction be greatly extended; let them be subjected to some vigilant superintendence, and we shall soon have a great change. The clergy often complain that the middle classes are the stronghold of dissent. Can any infatuation, then, be greater than neglecting this obvious means which the cathedral schools offer for uniting them in their youth by the best possible associations to the Church?

The Government have now taken a most important step towards the improvement of middle-class education by their Charitable Trusts Act. We have seen how great is the income of the charitable endowments for education throughout the kingdom. Of this a very large proportion is available for the education of the middle class. We are henceforward to have a distinct and easily accessible authority, similar to that of the Committee of Council on Education, exercising a general control over all such charitable funds. Like the Education Committee, the Board of Charity Commissioners is to have the power of issuing minutes to prescribe the rules according to which the work of the department will be conducted by its inspectors and other officers. It will make all preliminary inquiries as to the mode in which educational charities are administered, and this without cost; and the judges of the local courts, in the case of small charities, or, in the larger, the Master of the Rolls or the Vice-Chancellors sitting at chambers, are henceforward authorised summarily to carry into effect improvements which hitherto have been attainable only by a tedious and expensive chancery suit. Also it is the duty of the Charity Commissioners, where the alterations required in the application or administration of any charity are such as cannot be carried into effect by judicial authority, to prepare new schemes for a better appropriation of the funds of the charity,

and submit these schemes to Parliament, that they may be made law at the public expense.

We see in this a bright prospect of better days for the improvement of our ancient grammar schools; and one of the first improvements which we think ought to be made in them is, the establishment in each of an English or commercial department which shall give thoroughly good and useful instruction to the middle class.

We would not interfere with the Greek and Latin of the old Grammar School. All who wish it ought to have a classical education to prepare them for the Universities and the learned professions; and every facility should be given to such scholars of the middle or English school as show much promise of classical attainments, to go on in this line. Continually recruited by means of small exhibitions given to promising boys, who wish to rise from the schools for the poor below,—holding out as a reward to its own promising scholars the prospect of rising, if they are fit for it, to the Grammar School and the University, — placed under the charge of some thoroughly well educated master, and regularly subjected each year to some system of examination and inspection, our middle schools will attain new life and energy, and the children of farmers and small tradesmen may be thoroughly well instructed and trained. A good system, designed to effect this, cannot long be persisted in without producing a marked improvement in the whole middle class.* The new generation will be more intelligent, more diligent, more orderly in all their habits, and it will be the fault of the clergy if they are not also, by God's blessing, more religious than their fathers.

III. We come now to the education of the higher orders. We have seen how intimately the middle schools must be connected with the Grammar Schools. In England there is no sharp line of separation cutting off class from class. The Charity Commissioners will, we trust, soon find means for insisting that there shall be a good classical grammar school in every town. Here the children of the upper classes in the town must be so trained that, if they wish it, they may go straight from school to the Universities. These higher grammar schools, like the middle schools, must be periodically inspected and examined, and their funds must, if possible, be made available for assisting

* We must not forget how much is likely soon to be attained, for the improvement of Education in all the principal towns, by the well-directed efforts of the Board of Trade in its department of Science and Art.

the deserving to finish their studies at the University. Steps must be taken to secure that the prize of such assistance is never given except to merit tested by examination; and there will soon be no deserving boy in the kingdom in the lowest rank who may not, if his talents fit him for such promotion, win the highest University education by his industry.

Amongst the schools thus subjected to improvement there ought to be no exceptions. Eton and Westminster and Winchester call for the attention of the Commissioners as much as any other schools. The best interests of the country demand that these splendid institutions be made thoroughly useful — that all of them be opened to the easy admission of the best possible system of government and teaching. Is it notorious that, in the noble foundation of William of Wykeham, all the assistance which his munificence destined to promote learning is now made a matter of family patronage — that scholars are chosen from Winchester to New College not by merit, but by favour — that a place on the foundation is often promised to a child the moment he is born? Are nominations at the Charterhouse equally a matter of favour? The country has a right to a sifting examination into the condition of all the public schools, and an immediate reform of all such abuses. Some of the public schools are happily reformed already; but others — and these in some instances possessed of the noblest endowments — are believed to be greatly mismanaged. A proper administration of the public schools must go hand-in-hand with a proper administration of the Universities.

And now comes the greatest of all educational questions: What are we to expect in University Reform? We must be excused if we enter on this matter at considerable length. For the details of the subject are as yet but imperfectly understood by the public, and we apprehend that the friends of improvement are here threatened with a determined and systematic opposition, which, though it cannot ultimately prevail, may still make head against the best interests of the country for many years.

Fifteen months have passed since the Oxford and Cambridge Commissioners reported. Has any improvement as yet taken place? We have now before us the mature opinion of a Committee of the governing body of Oxford as to the reforms which may safely be conceded; and certainly, even if the Board of Heads shall think fit to act on the recommendations of this Committee, their improvements will not go to the root of the matter. Lord John Russell hit the nail on the head when he announced in his place in Parliament, that the Government would be satisfied with no scheme of University Reform

which did not contain arrangements for the following improvements:

1. The removal of restrictions on elections to fellowships, so that they shall become real rewards of merit.
2. An efficient alteration of the governing body of the University.
3. A great extension of the University to classes hitherto excluded.
4. The application of some portion of the college endowments towards the adequate payment of professors, that thus the Universities may be enabled to command the services of a body of really intelligent instructors.

Lord John Russell threw out incidentally a fifth suggestion of more doubtful expediency, viz., that the tenure of fellowships ought to be limited to comparatively a few years. The Commissioners have not recommended this change, and, perhaps, its introduction in Lord John's speech may be taken as a symptom that the Ministry believes public opinion to have gone beyond the Commissioners.* Certainly we have proof here of a strong conviction on the part of the Ministry that the present system on which fellowships are held must be very extensively altered. The very unsatisfactory state of the colleges of Oxford has principally forced this conclusion upon the public mind. The Commissioners state† that the colleges of Oxford 'receive, 'it is said, not much less than 150,000*l.* per annum between 'them from endowments, exclusively of what is paid by the 'students. This might be rendered a noble provision for learning and science; but if these endowments were multiplied tenfold, and distributed to a tenfold number of fellows elected,' (as in the overwhelming majority of cases at present), 'without 'reference to their talents and acquirements, little would result 'but increased odium to the University. The architectural 'magnificence of Oxford would be diminished, and many excellent men would suffer, and great opportunities of future 'good will be lost, if several of its richest colleges were swept 'away; but little present loss would be sustained by the University, the Church, or the nation.'

In these matters Oxford is the great offender. Magdalen

* The arguments against such a change seem to us very grave. Scarcely anything which has yet been proposed would more surely tend to the ruin of the collegiate system of which our Universities are justly very tenacious. Even now it is difficult for a Fellow to look upon his college as a home: after such a change this would be impossible.

† Oxford Commissioners' Report, p. 151.

College, Oxford, possesses, it is stated, an income not widely different from that of Trinity College, Cambridge.* The fellows of Magdalen are forty in number. The value of the junior fellowships is returned by Mr. Senior at 250*l.* a year.† The value of the senior fellowships is known to be very much greater. These forty fellows, with the president, educate some twenty-two persons. These twenty-two persons ought certainly to be well educated, for it would appear that an income of not less than 15,000*l.* a year of endowments, at the least, besides all they contribute themselves in the shape of college fees, produces no fruit but their instruction. Yet, strange to say, this college is not particularly famous for the honours attained by its undergraduates. We believe it has gained one first class in classics during the last six years. But, perhaps, the forty fellows are all prosecuting their own learned studies, and have no time to give to instruction. If so, the results of their studies have not yet appeared. And Trinity College, Cambridge, with similar endowments, educates some 400 undergraduates, and vindicates for itself the noblest place in all competitions for university honours, and has of late years numbered amongst its fellows the greatest galaxy of distinguished names to be found in the lists of any educational establishment in the world. No wonder that the fellows of Magdalen have provoked the Ministry to declare that their slumbers must be rudely broken, and that in future, unless they show themselves more useful, they must be turned out of their fellowships at the end of seven years. But, the extraordinary contrast between Magdalen, Oxford, and Trinity College, Cambridge, may be easily accounted for by the fact, that the fellowships of Trinity are the rewards of merit, tested by examination, and are open to the generous competition of a large body of distinguished scholars; while at Magdalen, the process by which the fellows have been selected is as follows:—A boy of seventeen or eighteen has been chosen to a scholarship because he was born in a certain county; if several candidates offered themselves from the favoured county, it depended on the conscience or caprice of the person who had the nomination whether he would select the best scholar or his own nephew. And it is notorious that claims of kindred or private friendships have continually turned the scale. The boy thus elected to a scholarship has succeeded to his fellowship as a matter of course. It is not surprising that thus chosen, and thus carefully guarded from the necessity of exertion to secure their further advance-

* Oxford Commissioners' Report, p. 152. † Ibid. p. 223.

ment, the monks of Magdalen should be somewhat given to repose. No wonder that the fellows of this college should not be great Reformers. A slight change for the better in the mode of electing to scholarships has, indeed, been introduced since Lord John Russell showed that he was in earnest in the determination to reform. Of the candidates who offer themselves from the favoured county the best is now selected by the College officers; but the competition is still narrowed further than the statutes require, and the scholar once elected is still allowed to succeed to his fellowship without further competition, retaining his scholarship for this purpose far beyond the statutable age.* Magdalen, unfortunately, is only a type of many colleges, and who can be surprised that such a system of electing fellows has inflicted deep injury on the whole University?

'There are in Oxford 542 fellowships. . . . From this body of men has to be selected all the studying and all the educating power of the University—all the professors, all the tutors, all those who pursue learning for its own sake, and beyond the needs of practical life.

'Out of this number only 22 are in such a sense open, that a young man on first coming up sees his way clear towards them with no other bar than may arise from his own want of talents or diligence. The rest are almost all restricted to: 1st, Persons born in particular localities; 2nd, Founders' kin; 3rd, Persons educated in particular schools. The only fellowships not so restricted are 10 at Balliol, 12 at Oriel, and 61 at Christ Church; and the latter are practically close, being in the gift of the canons in rotation, who treat them very much as private property.' †

The same evidence has said:

'The system of election to fellowships is above all other defects at Oxford that whose remedy is most needed and most important. . . . . If no other change were made than to throw all the fellowships open, . . . . all other reforms would follow spontaneously. A body of men elected in the interests of learning would be sure in course of time to adapt everything to the needs of learning.'

The Government therefore have done wisely in announcing that they will not rest satisfied unless restrictions on the elec-

---

* Oxford Commissioners' Report, pp. 221, 222, 223.

† Ibid., quoting Mr. Temple's Evidence, p. 149. The real state of the case as to close fellowships in Oxford is the more necessary to be insisted on, because a table has recently been published which is calculated to give a very erroneous impression. Some of the closest fellowships in the University are therein paraded as wholly free from local restrictions. It cannot be too often repeated, that out of more than 500 fellowships in Oxford only 22 are bestowed simply with reference to merit.

tions to fellowships be removed, and they be thrown open to public competition. We shall consider the prospects of reform, first, as relates to this head.

1. How are fellowships to be thrown open? At Cambridge, from happy circumstances, the restrictions are comparatively few. But we see how they cripple Oxford. Now, this reform cannot be effected by the colleges themselves. The heads and fellows of colleges are bound to the inviolable observation of their statutes by oaths.* 'The oath imposed upon 'the fellows of New College fills more than three closely 'printed octavo pages; that of the warden no less than five. 'The following clauses of the oath refer to the observance of 'statutes. They are found almost in the same words in the 'codes of Magdalen and Corpus. . . . . "I will in no wise '"entertain any other statutes or ordinances, interpretations, '"changes, injunctions, declarations, expositions, or any other '"glosses anywise repugnant to the present ordinances and sta-'"tutes, or to the true sense and meaning of the same. . . . . '"Nor will I consent to such—nor in any manner acknowledge '"them—nor obey them at any time—nor take notice of them '"—nor in any way use them, or any one of them, in the '"college or abroad, directly or indirectly."' The observance of such oaths is enforced by the founder of Magdalen, 'under 'the pain of anathema and the wrath of Almighty God.' It is true that in many very important points the statutes, obedience to which is sought thus awfully to be enforced, neither are nor can be obeyed. But the oath still presents an insuperable barrier to a deliberate alteration of the statutes by the fellows themselves. It seems strange, that, after the disclosures made with respect to these oaths, even a single session should have been allowed to pass without a Bill being brought into Parliament to render such oaths illegal. Their profanity is a scandal, independently of the obstacle which they present to all improvement. We trust that the Ministry are prepared to deal with them early next Session. The Committee of the Oxford Heads of Houses has recommended that such oaths should be 'pro-'hibited by the Law of the Land.' Vide Report, p. 92.

But, even supposing these shameful oaths removed, the difficulty is by no means overcome. No college in Oxford has power to alter its own statutes. Neither has the visitor such power; on the contrary, it is his especial duty as visitor to see that they are obeyed. There are a few exceptions where the sovereign is founder; but, speaking generally, we know of no practicable way

* Oxford Commissioners' Report, p. 146.

in which such statutes can be altered except by the authority of Parliament. As matters stand at present, even if the oaths were removed, all that the colleges themselves and the visitors could possibly do would be to beg Parliament to exercise such authority.

The Government has announced that it will only wait a short time to see whether the Universities are themselves disposed to introduce the required changes. We presume Lord John Russell never intended that the University should itself effect the changes he specified. With regard to the particular change of throwing open fellowships, neither the University as a body nor the separate colleges have any power. In this particular, at least, we presume it is not acts, but suggestions, that the Government has waited for.

No real University reform is possible without a reform of the colleges. We see that, with regard to this most pressing matter of reform, the colleges have no power. It remains to inquire how far, since the warning so distinctly given by Government, they have manifested a willingness to make suggestions in the proper quarter, and to invoke other aid where they are themselves powerless. The attempts made to open any fellowships have as yet been very faint. Pembroke College, in Oxford, indeed, of which one of the Commissioners is Master, and which is most miserably depressed by close fellowships, has tried to move. But, if Pembroke has Dr. Jeune for its Master, it has Lord Derby for its Visitor; and there seems little doubt, from what he is reported to have announced, that Lord Derby will use his influence against the movement for opening the fellowships.

In some other colleges besides Pembroke, there have been symptoms of a desire to move; but the desire is different from the power. In most cases the desire extends to a small fraction of the society; and therefore the obstructive majority simply extinguishes all hope of improvement by its vote. In some instances the visitor seems to have been appealed to merely that the sanction of his authority may be given to the continuance of existing evils.

The time must, of course, be limited during which the Government can with propriety wait for the suggestions of the University and colleges. There are not wanting symptoms that that time has now expired. Last Session was too fruitful of great measures of pressing importance to leave any reason for complaint as to the delay which has hitherto occurred. But with respect to the opening of Fellowships, we now hope for speedy action. The Government, by the Charitable Trusts Act,

has constituted an authority to effect the alteration of statutes and wills of founders in the case of all other charities. We trust that they are prepared forthwith to take similar vigorous steps for the improvement of our Oxford and Cambridge colleges. The Committee of the Oxford Heads (vide Report, p. 92.) seem to approve of the interference of Parliament that a proper central power may be constituted to sanction necessary change: but, strange to say, they have recorded their deliberate opinion that any general opening of scholarships or fellowships to public competition is neither necessary nor desirable (vide pp. 93. 95.). The Government, on the contrary, has rightly selected the opening of fellowships as the most important point in college-reform. In this matter nothing can be done without the interference of Parliament.

But perhaps, though powerless as yet in this particular, the colleges are eagerly at work to effect other reforms. We trust this may be found to be so; but we confess we have but little hope of any great general movement in the colleges from within. The best colleges — those which least need improvement — will probably be ready to improve; but those in which improvement is most needed are precisely those in which nothing will be done. If an enabling Act were passed to-morrow, the worst colleges would not avail themselves of its powers. The Oxford Commissioners* state that 'the Duke of Wellington is reported 'to have assured the House of Lords, in 1838, that the heads of 'houses had undertaken to revise the statutes of their several 'colleges;' but that, 'whatever may have been their wish and 'intention, no result has ensued.' His Grace is reported to have said, on the 9th of July, 1838†: 'With respect to the 'colleges, I have received accounts from several of them that 'they are reviewing their statutes. Several of the colleges are 'in communication with their respective visitors; and others 'are in communication with the fellows of the college with 'whom they must communicate in order to make effectual 'reforms in their statutes. They are going on as well as they can 'at the present moment; and I entreat your Lordships to let 'them work out these reforms as they think fit; and if they are 'not executed in accordance with your Lordships' wishes, it will 'then be time for the House to take such steps as may seem 'necessary.' This was the game by which the colleges eluded the demand for reform fifteen years ago. They made a show of being very busy in reforming themselves; and it all ended,

---

* Report, p. 148. † Ibid. p. 7.

as it was sure to end, in their doing nothing. Let the Government beware how it is deluded again by the same game.

Be it understood distinctly, that when we thus speak of the colleges, we readily acknowledge the existence of a few honourable exceptions; but we speak of such societies in Oxford as Magdalen, New College, Queen's. It pains us to do so; but we fear in justice we ought to add that there is little hope of internal reform in Christ Church, which has of late years sadly fallen from its high supremacy.

All practically acquainted with Oxford know that it contains a few good and many bad colleges. Most of the good colleges will no doubt exert themselves to accomplish internal reform where it is possible; and they will gladly hail higher assistance from without in those points in which statutes and legal rights have made them powerless to improve. The bad colleges will do nothing. If they appear to be busy, this is merely a feint. A few active spirits, in such a college, may be trying to bring about improvement; but they are a small minority, sure to be outvoted, and have no real power.

One college in Oxford has indeed greatly distinguished itself during the year of waiting; and its fellows deserve the thanks of the country. The founder of Corpus Christi College designed it to be a great place of education. He looked forward to its exercising a marked influence on the studies of the whole University. For this purpose he appointed that there should be lecturers in Greek, Latin, and Theology, to give instruction to the whole University, who should receive adequate payment from the funds of his college.* These lectureships had long fallen into complete abeyance: as at Magdalen, the founder of which made a similar provision, the office of public lecturer had long existed merely in name. The same system by which the cathedral schools have so greatly suffered, and by which the Fellows of Trinity College, Cambridge, continued to pay to the Regius Professors 40*l.*, when that sum, originally equivalent to more than two fellowships, has, from the altered value of money, become a totally inadequate remuneration, had proved fatal to the lecturers of Corpus. This was pointed out in the Commissioners' Report. There certainly was no legal obligation on the present holders of fellowships to remedy a defect which had gradually crept in from ancient times, and in which they might well have thought they had no responsibility. The world could hardly have found any fault with them if they had urged that similar evils had crept unperceived into almost every an-

* Vide Oxford Commissioners' Report, p. 229.

cient foundation in the kingdom, and had represented that the funds now divided amongst the Head and Fellows were not more than sufficient for their proper maintenance, and that therefore they could not be expected to make a large deduction from their moderate private incomes for public purposes which have long been in desuetude. It is thus that every cathedral in England, and most colleges in both Universities, have reasoned under similar circumstances. It is thus, we presume, that Mr. Whiston reasons at Trinity, where he is a member of the body that shares in the dividend, though he is very vehement in maintaining the opposite argument at Rochester. But the President and Fellows of Corpus resolved in this matter to act with a noble disinterestedness; and they have given an example to every corporation in the land. The University was casting about for the means of endowing a new professorship of Latin. The Fellows of Corpus called to mind what the Commissioners' Report had pointed out to them of the long-neglected intentions of their founder; and they came forward, we are told, with a proposition, that by a tax upon their own moderate incomes, they should raise at once 300*l.*, and ultimately 600*l.* a year, and place it at the disposal of the University for the endowment of this professorship. Such an act shows the spirit which animates the good colleges. Corpus has begun vigorously to carry out other reforms; and it has a few coadjutors in the same praiseworthy course. We shall soon, we trust, hear of petitions from the better colleges to the Legislature imploring such assistance as will enable them to effect real and lasting reforms.

But, as we have said before, the number of colleges which can be expected thus to petition the Legislature to aid them in the work of self reform is very limited. Some love the present bad system. Others are restrained simply by the *vis inertiæ* inherent in corporations.

All Souls, with its stately buildings and magnificent library, its forty fellowships and its revenue of 9000*l.* a year, shows no symptom of departing from its present position of an agreeable country club, offering, as its contribution to the cause of learning, the education of three Bible clerks.* The head and fellows are understood not to be averse to change; but they feel no call to originate it, and know not how to set to work. If the work is done for them by Government, it is probable they will readily acquiesce. But they are men who love an elegant and easy life—scattered throughout the country or in foreign parts. It would be really too much to expect of them, that they are de-

* Oxford Commissioners' Report, p. 219.

liberately to disquiet their peaceful existence by taking upon themselves all the labour of a very difficult reform.

All Souls supplies one type, Queen's another. Let any one read the account of Queen's in the 201st page of the Oxford Commissioners' Report. Here is a great society with noble endowments, a princely library, buildings of great beauty and extent capable of accommodating 100 students, with richly endowed fellowships, which the founder certainly intended should not be exclusively confined. While he was evidently anxious that persons 'sprung 'from the counties of Westmoreland and Cumberland, and espe- 'cially those of his own blood,' should have a preference, he expressly declares that the ground of his preference for the northern counties was to be found in the circumstances of his own time; and in his own time he only selected one Fellow out of twelve from these counties. He states his wish that no race or well-deserving nation should be excluded, 'so that the elec- 'tion should be as general as the collection of scholars to the 'University is universal.' The mode in which these intentions are carried out at present is as follows: The preference to the kindred of the founder is disregarded entirely, but that given to the natives of the northern counties has been converted by long usage into an absolute exclusion of all others. No person not born in Cumberland and Westmoreland is received as a candidate. The society openly violates the founder's express injunction that no one shall be elected who is not a master of arts, rather than allow the competition to be thrown open beyond the favoured clique. The college, consequently, has declined. Its numbers are small—its reputation not good. The best specimens even of the two favoured counties shun the college. A prudent father prefers that his son, if a lad of talent, should push his way unaided in a good and open society rather than be ruined by the sure possession of 300*l.* a year in a dull place where there is no competition and no intellectual life. For twenty years one or two energetic reformers, rising above the narrow clique, in which, to their loss, they have found themselves, have striven to cleanse this Augean stable; but they have been powerless against the surrounding mass. Men intended by nature for trade or agriculture, forced by the monopoly of the favoured counties into the situation of fellows, of what ought to be a learned society, feel naturally enough that they cannot make up their minds to destroy the very system to which they owe their livelihood. At any college meeting in which there is fear of improvement, a rush is made from the remote country districts, where these Bœotians, between audit and audit, forget the difficulties of their false

position in society more congenial to their tastes than is to be found in a learned university, and all propositions for improvement are met with dogged obstinacy. Unless we are misinformed, this very summer, after the Report of the Commission, in spite of the Government warning, and the indignant remonstrance of all who really wish the college well, the same tactics have been repeated.

The Government need hesitate no longer. This college at least has deliberately declared that it holds all reform in abhorrence. And strange to say, this college boasts that it has no regular visitor, and is responsible, therefore, for its misdoings to no head on earth.* Parliament cannot further overlook such a state of things. Even if other societies were to remain untouched, a Bill must be introduced for the improvement of Queen's College. The little good it does is to enable by its Exhibitions a few deserving youths to come to Oxford, whose circumstances would otherwise exclude them. But this charitable office it could perform far better if it were thoroughly reformed. Its existence in its present state is a prostitution of noble endowments, and a real injury to the cause of education and learning.

II. The second, like the third and the fourth Government head of reform, concerns the University directly, without the intervention of the colleges. And there is little doubt that in matters included under all these three heads the University can, if it pleases, move for itself. When we say the University can move, we mean, when we speak of Oxford, the Heads of Houses can.† In Cambridge the matter is different; but it is well known that in Oxford nothing can be changed in the University unless the Heads of Houses consent to set the change in motion. And the first modest demand which the Government has made on the locomotive power of these functionaries, is, that they should displace themselves. A narrow oligarchy, the members of which depend on their present position for much of their social importance, is courteously requested to resign its exclusive privileges. We can hardly think that the Government seriously expected any very effectual change to originate from this quarter. It must be merely that Government very properly wished to avoid the appearance of acting roughly: and was contented to wait courteously for a time, that it might act more effectually at last.

---

* Oxford Report, p. 203.

† In this particular matter — the alteration of the governing body in Oxford — the consent of the Crown will be required.

Meanwhile, this courteous conduct of the Government must not be carried too far. They have to deal with a body which, powerless for any great improvement in this particular matter, has a wonderful vitality in all its powers of obstruction. We have already seen how it managed to play off the Duke of Wellington for fifteen years. And now, as fifteen years ago, the Heads of Houses profess that they are very busy in the work of internal reform. No sooner had it become evident that Government would insist on reform, than they immediately appointed a committee. This committee, we understand, sat for three days of each week from January to June. The discussions have, of course, been private: but even from the innermost recesses of such a sanctuary a few secrets percolate to the outer air. The report of this committee is now before the public; but long before its publication, the project of reform in University government, which it was to contain, was pretty generally known: so that it has already received a good deal of consideration in Oxford. The reform of the governing body of the University — what is called the Hebdomadal Board — at present a narrow oligarchy, consisting of the two Proctors and twenty-four Heads of Houses, who have an exclusive power of originating every University measure, and who are sadly ignorant of the wants and feelings of the University — is the one University Reform which men of every shade of opinion in Oxford, not themselves members of the oligarchy, have united in loudly demanding. The destruction of this oligarchy is felt by all parties to be the indispensable preliminary before anything really useful can be done. Goaded by attacks from all quarters, the Committee of the Oxford Heads has found it impossible to resist all change: but we cannot bring ourselves to think that the change they are willing to concede, even supposing the General Board of Heads to approve it, will be accepted by the University or the country. The oligarchy, we have seen, consists of twenty-four Heads of Houses and the two Proctors — these last being Masters of Arts who hold their office only for one year, and who, therefore, are completely powerless against their twenty-four colleagues installed for life. The committee recommends a concession to public opinion by proposing the introduction of eight other Masters of Arts. It is obviously very easy for twenty-four permanent members of a board to overpower eight interlopers. The Tutors and Professors will not be satisfied with such a representation. In the Oxford Board of Heads of Houses are many estimable, and some really able, men; but, as a body, they are most singularly ignorant of the state of

public feeling both within and without the University. Were it not hopeless, we should beg of the General Board of Heads of Houses, when they meet, to consider what practical measures ought to be founded on the recommendations of their Committee — what steps are necessary in consequence of the Home Secretary's recent letter to their Chancellor — to reperuse the evidence in the Commissioners' report as to the universal feeling which condemns their present board. They may rest assured that no change less sweeping than that by which the Commissioners propose to place a large share of the government of the University in the hands of its real instructors will be accepted.

A remarkable proof of this is given by the deliberations of another body, which the agitation of the last two years has called into existence. Those who know how completely the tutors are excluded from any power in the government of the University, have no doubt been surprised by seeing paragraphs, especially in the High Church newspapers, of the extreme activity with which the Oxford tutors have been engaged in maturing schemes of University Reform. A voluntary association of tutors has been formed, and has issued three reports.* The unknowing public has even been deluded, by the representations of the newspapers we have mentioned, into an idea that these tutors have some sort of power. They are, in fact, simply a debating society; and the subject of debate which they have lately selected has been University Reform. We are inclined to think that great good has arisen from these debates. By printing the results of their deliberations, the Tutors' Association have accustomed the minds of even the most obstructive masters of arts to the idea that some great changes are indispensable. In some points these tutors have gone beyond the Commissioners, and, especially, in this point of the changes requisite in the composition of the Hebdomadal Board. We strongly advise all who think that this governing body may be patched up in nearly its present state to peruse No. II. of the publications of the Tutors' Association; from which it appears that the tutors have resolved, not like the Commissioners, to remove the exclusive right of initiation possessed by the Hebdomadal Board, but utterly to annihilate that body and substitute another in its place, which bears no resemblance to it, except in meeting for the despatch of business once a week. They recommend that the new board, instead

* Reports of the Oxford Tutors' Association, No. I., No. II.' No. III. Oxford, J. H. Parker, 1853.

of persons holding their power in virtue of their academical position, should consist of twenty-seven delegates, and that every year there should be a popular election. On the merits of this plan, as contrasted with that proposed for Oxford by the Commissioners, or with any other effectual scheme which may be devised, or on its connexion with the scheme of the Cambridge Report, we have no wish to enter. What we urge is, that, instead of modifying the power of the Oxford Heads, it deposes them altogether, taking away both their dignity and their privileges, and transferring both to another body; and that its publication ought to convince the Oxford Board, when they look at the names by which it is signed, that the change in their constitution which their committee has recommended to them will not give satisfaction even to the most conservative body of actual instructors in their University.

III. The third point on which the Government mean to insist is University Extension. At present, in both Universities, the existing colleges and halls enjoy an unfair monopoly: no student can be a member of the University who is not a member of one of these subordinate bodies. The consequence has been, as in all monopolies, that — competition being removed — these bodies have not felt themselves stimulated to improve their system, and expenses have risen very high. In Cambridge, as is well known, the good colleges have greatly extended themselves by allowing undergraduates to live in lodgings. But in Oxford, all undergraduates must pass three years within the limited space of the college walls. Consequently, the good colleges cannot accommodate any very large number of students; the result is, that the worst are sure of not being entirely deserted. Young men frequent them because they must. If a parent destines his son for holy orders he must send him to college. The natural tendency of this state of things is, that many persons who ought to have a university education are excluded. The whole scale of university expenses has become so high, that prudent fathers, even if they can afford the money, do not wish to expose their sons to the risk of contracting college habits of expense, unless actually compelled. Hence, with the exception of a certain proportion of intended barristers, young men destined to work their way in any profession other than the Church are scarcely ever sent to the University; and Oxford and Cambridge have lost much of their hold over the general body of intelligent men who are working in non-clerical professions. The number of barristers who receive a University education is diminishing: There are, we may say, no solicitors — no medical practitioners —

no engineers, bankers, or merchants — educated at Oxford or Cambridge.

Now, few will doubt that the right plan for curing many evils connected with this subject, is the abolition of that monopoly, to which so much of the inefficiency and expensiveness of the present system is owing. The Oxford Commissioners have proposed that colleges shall be allowed and encouraged greatly to extend their accommodation — that thus the bad colleges may be forced to improvement by entering into a fair competition with the good, instead of being, as at present, filled by those young men who are compelled to have recourse to them, because they cannot obtain admission elsewhere. They have proposed also, that every facility should be given for increasing this wholesome competition by allowing the foundation of new colleges and halls; and, lastly, they have recommended that young men, whose parents wish it, shall be allowed, under certain restrictions, to become students at the University, without the expense of belonging to any collegiate body.

Apprehensions were expressed in a former Number of our Review lest this last recommendation should be found to go too far. Much has been done, however, to recommend this plan by the Tutors' Association. This body has expressed the same apprehensions to which we formerly gave utterance, and which are very generally felt; but they seem to have discovered a way by which all such apprehensions may be dissipated. We believe that their recommendation on this subject, while differing in name from that of the Commissioners, against which the tutors protest somewhat strongly, is substantially the same; and the plan, as brought forward by the tutors, is certainly guarded against any danger of too unrestricted liberty. The Oxford Commissioners have recommended that young men may prosecute their studies at the University, living as economically as they please in private houses, and attending the instructions of university lecturers: but they have added (p. 52.): —

'These students should be kept under due superintendence. Besides the control exercised over the lodging-house keepers by the University . . . . such students would be as much amenable to University discipline as any others in the place, and in this respect their situation would be very different from that of medical and law students in London. . . . But, besides such means of control, we recommend that such lodging-houses should be placed under the special superintendence of University officers, to be constituted tutors or guardians of the University students. . . . Their duty would be, so far as the case permitted, to acquaint themselves with the character and circumstances of these students, and to take all means in their power for

exercising over them a due moral and religious superintendence. The University could easily arrange a system according to which such superintendence could be beneficially exercised, and it would not be difficult to find fellows of colleges who would take a lively interest in such an occupation.'

Perhaps sufficient prominence was hardly given in the Commissioners' Report to this passage, and the sentiments it contains. Certainly a good deal of misconception might have been dispelled had this superintendence been dwelt on more at large. The Association of Tutors seems to have overlooked the limitation which the Commissioners propose. Hence they speak as if they totally disapproved of this plan. But in reality they have adopted it. The Commissioners have said, 'the University 'could easily arrange a system according to which such super-'intendence' as they recommend to be entrusted to the tutors or guardian of these independent 'students could be bene-'ficially exercised.' The Tutors' Association proposes that the guardians should reside in the same house with the pupils, and that the lodging house should be called a private hall. We presume there is no need to quarrel about a name; and residence in the same house will probably be a very good way of securing efficient superintendence. The Tutors' Association, speaking of the admission of such independent students, thus urges the case (No. I. p. 21.): —

'Other plans (for University Extension), desirable as we hold them to be, are simply extensions of colleges. This alone gives a place for the emulation of independent establishments. This alone would remove the exclusiveness, which would in some degree be the result of an education being limited to colleges—it would be the means of retaining some of our best teachers within the University' (*i. e.*, they mean, heads of these independent establishments); 'it would stimulate our whole teaching by the competition of various classes; and while it would often meet the case of the extremely poor, it would be equally available for young men from the upper classes, whose friends might desire for them more complete domestic superintendence.'

The Committee of Heads of Houses have expressed their disapproval of this unrestricted competition; but they agree with the Tutors and the Commissioners in recommending that means should be taken to enable the existing colleges greatly to extend their accommodation and to associate with themselves halls which they may keep under their own management. This is one step in the right direction, though it cannot meet the wants of the case. We cannot look so favourably on their other proposal to spend 10,000*l.* of the University's money on the foundation of a new independent hall. Before

this expenditure is incurred, the public is entitled to demand that all the existing colleges and halls be made thoroughly useful, and that the Tutors' plan of private halls be tried, which would call for no wasteful outlay and might be contracted or expanded according to demand.

This subject of University Extension has an important bearing on the improvement of education generally throughout the land, and the establishment of that connexion which we anxiously hope for, between the systems of education for the several orders in the community. Every Government inspector will vouch for the fact, that many certificated masters of schools for the poor would be glad to improve their knowledge and their chances of advancement in life by studying at the University. It would be a great advantage if all masters of our middle schools were persons who had received a liberal education. Besides, it is most desirable that means should be opened up, by diminishing expenses, for the easy admission to Oxford and Cambridge of promising scholars from our lower schools. The plan thus sanctioned in substance, both by the Oxford Commissioners and the Oxford tutors, is the only right way to admit students of a lower class. Fellowships and scholarships have now become situations of influence and honour; it would be wrong to appoint men to these simply because they are poor. But thoroughly improve the Universities by such reforms as have been proposed; let the Universities be open to the poorest students, not by a forced system of charity, but if they are willing to fight their way; and let them know that, once in Oxford, they have before them the prospect of a free competition to 500 open fellowships, and improvement will soon work downwards: we should soon feel the stimulus in every school in the land.

IV. On the subject of the reorganisation of the professorial body — the fourth of the Government requirements — we never looked for many valuable internal suggestions, either from Oxford or Cambridge, except such as emanate from individuals. We could scarcely anticipate that either the Heads or the Tutors as a body should advocate any effectual Reform in this matter. Heads and Tutors, differing in so many other points, agree in their dislike of those who would prove rivals, with whom it would be very difficult to compete. The twenty-four Heads of Oxford would sink at once in social importance if confronted by twenty-four Professors chosen from the ablest men in the land, invested with sufficient University authority, and induced by sufficient endowments to make the University their home. The Tutors also would occupy a somewhat different po-

sition if their monopoly of instruction was abolished. We know both Heads and Tutors to be above any conscious jealousy of the Professors; but it is human nature to have an instinctive shrinking from innovations which necessarily imply a diminution of our own power as well as a very considerable alteration of the system under which we have long lived. Hence we are quite prepared for a determined resistance, in both quarters, to any extensive and energetic organisation of the professorial body.

To the Third Report of the Oxford Tutors' Association, indeed, while it strenuously and justly maintains the great value of the tutors' office, we are indebted for a clear statement, reduced in the Appendix to a table, of many great duties in the University, which require an efficient staff of thirty-three active professors. But an obvious feeling of alarm pervades the whole Report, lest these professors thus called into activity may become too powerful. Therefore the tutors' scheme, probably without their intending it, effectually guards against the professorships being usually filled by first-rate men. It is proposed that their emoluments should rarely exceed that moderate sum which a tutor now receives from his fellowship and tutorship, which will certainly not be enough to retain eminent men in the University for life; while a strenuous opposition is made to the very obvious plan which the Commissioners have suggested for training up fit candidates to fill the professorships as they become vacant, and no other plan is offered in its place.

That part of the Report of the Oxford Heads' Committee which treats of Professors is meagre and unsatisfactory in the extreme. This was only what was to be expected. In all that the Heads of Houses in Oxford have hitherto done for Professors, they have taken care, by the smallness of the stipends they have awarded, to guard against the establishment of any rivals near their own throne.* They are obviously not at all

* A very little matter often indicates the bent of men's thoughts. We cannot but think that one little suggestion (Report, p. 56.) well illustrates the view which the Committee of Heads takes of the Professor's office. They wish to meet the difficulty of raising a few hundred pounds to increase the present wretched stipends, and they have given a prominent place to this notable device. At present the Vice-Chancellor has six bedels to walk before him with maces on great occasions. They propose to reduce the number to two, and apply the wages of the other four to the endowment of Professorships. Why have they hesitated to suggest that, in order to mark their position, the Professors should themselves shoulder the maces and do the lictors' work?

aware of the great importance of securing first-rate instructors for the rising generation of students — men of real eminence, and who are willing to devote their lives to the pursuit of the studies they have selected. They form a low estimate of the sort of instruction necessary for undergraduates, and are quite contented with that very inferior teaching, which even the worst tutors of inferior colleges are found at present capable of imparting — men selected not from fitness for their calling, but because they are born in particular counties, or have been educated at particular schools. A story has been current in Oxford for many months which seems to show that this Committee of Heads is scarcely likely to take a very practical view of the present deficiency of the Professoriate. The only suggestion said to have been made on this subject by the most distinguished member of the Committee is, that there was certainly one professorship which it would be well to establish, viz., a Professorship of Chinese. Whether this suggestion was made seriously or in bitter irony, we cannot say. The proposer is not a man commonly supposed to be given to jesting: and he was evidently understood at the time to be serious by another Head, who, kindling at the thought of the expansiveness of his learned brother's soul, is said to have followed up the suggestion, by hinting that it would be well to have another professorship for the languages of Southern Africa. The Committee, on mature reflection, have been so pleased with the suggestion that to the astonishment of all who have been laughing at it for the last nine months, they have formally given the Chinese Professor a prominent place in their Report. We presume the learned Committee were of the opinion, that all branches of European learning are already so admirably taught in the University, that there is no room for improvement without seeking for the materials of progress in the very extremities of the earth. Not even the sacred cause of missions with which the Committee have connected it, ought to make us hesitate to stigmatise this Chinese proposition as an absurdity, while so many of our most obviously needful branches of learning are but ill taught.

But we have reason to believe that the nation in general has formed a different opinion of the perfection of the present University instruction. The Oxford Commissioners' Report has surely proved that the University requires far abler instructors than it at present possesses — men of great reputation, who will therefore command the respect of their pupils — men of enthusiasm in the studies which they have selected as the business and pleasure of their lives — men who are contented to withdraw from the

rivalry of a profession and the bustle of life that they may give themselves to these studies, and have the high satisfaction of kindling a noble desire to pursue them amongst a generous youth —men who are the leaders of the thoughts of their fellow-men, each in his own branch of science. A galaxy of such men every great university ought to use every means to gather within its circle; but we look in vain for such men amongst the habitual teachers either of Oxford or Cambridge. Her Majesty's Commissioners have proposed to make the Professoriate a reality. They have endeavoured to answer the popular objections to professorial teaching. They have shown that the instruction of college tutors is not only at present notoriously deficient, but never can be made of itself sufficient to meet the wants of the University; indeed, that it will best perform its peculiar work, and become most perfect, when it goes side by side with the teaching of able professors. They have pointed out, moreover, the unreasonableness of those suspicions with which many look upon the teaching of professors, as likely to introduce German and other foreign modes of thought into our Universities.

'It is evident,' says the Oxford Commissioners' Report (p. 96.), 'on a more careful consideration of the subject, that an active system of professors would, in fact, be the best safeguard against such an evil. "I cannot help observing," says Professor Vaughan, "that such an apprehension appears to me hasty and ill-founded, and, indeed, if duly considered, the reverse of the truth. At the present moment the teaching of the University is, on the whole, indirectly determined (so far as the information itself is concerned) by the professorial system. Our classical manuals, editions, histories, grammars, &c. are the work of professors. These professors are foreigners; and, as we have no similar class in our own University, which might supply us, their superiority to our home-grown literature on such subjects is incontestable. The University is thus obliged to adopt the works of foreigners on many subjects; and with this is coupled the necessity of instilling in some degree their general principles of criticism and philosophy. Had we a professorial system of our own, embracing all the great subjects of instruction, the national character and genius would assert itself in their works. The spirit of our institutions, intellectual character, domestic life, and moral qualities, would necessarily be at work in the minds of our professors, to form a literature and philosophy independent, native, and in the truest and most valuable sense congenial: it would, therefore, not tend to make us copyists of foreign systems, either in form or spirit, but would open for us a new source of independence in these things." '

In this reading age undergraduates, of course, have their professors; but they are men uninfluenced by the feelings of English university-life. The intellectual influence of our universities is at this moment, in a great degree, wielded by foreign

writers, many of them of a very doubtful stamp. If young men cannot find instructors at home, they must seek them elsewhere; and, provided they find talent, they will not be very particular as to the tone in which the instruction is given.

The Commissioners proposed adequately to endow all the most important professorships. For this purpose they invoked the aid of Parliament. Both the Cambridge and Oxford Commissioners insist that fully adequate endowments for the purpose may be found in the revenues of the colleges without at all impairing their collegiate usefulness. It was proposed also to give to professors great weight in the government of the University, and to secure a succession of professors, by making university instruction a regular line of life, to which any man of literary ability may look for a livelihood. The professors ought to be assisted by a large body of sub-professors or lecturers, who will make the University their home, and teaching their life's business, not, as the tutors make it, a mere work by the way, which is to occupy them for a few years till they go off to a country living or the bar. This body of sub-professors will always afford the materials from which the greater professors can be chosen.

These sub-professors we regard as an indispensable part of a sound reform. The example of the richly-endowed Theological Faculty at Christ Church has in former times shown that, unless a new system be devised to supply candidates for the chairs as they become vacant, wealthy professorships may be mere sleeping-places. The office of University Instructor must become a profession; and a vigorous competition must urge all to the discharge of their duties. If one of the greater professors becomes unwilling or unable to fulfil his mission, he must find in the presence of these younger rivals, in the one case a stimulus to his exertions, in the other an abundant means of securing valuable aid. We trust that we shall see the proposed plan soon adopted for the establishment and adequate payment of a large staff of professors and sub-professors or public lecturers. Other reforms are indispensable for the better management of the academic machinery; but machinery, however well contrived, will be useless without a power to set it in motion; and to the professors and sub-professors of a new system we look for a great accession of intellectual life.

We will not weary our readers by showing more in detail how useful such a professorial system might be in Law, History, or Philosophy. But we must not altogether pass by Theology. The inert state of the Theological Faculty at Oxford is the strong hold of all who argue against the usefulness of a pro-

fessoriate. Certainly, as we have said, it is not want of endowments that has failed to secure here the desired result. Each of the Christ Church professorships is believed to be worth about 1,500*l.* a year. It would be wrong to speak otherwise than with respect of the learned and worthy men who at present hold these professorships, who are all conscientiously anxious to work; but something paralyses their efforts. There are doubtless other obstacles in the present system impeding their usefulness; but one great reason for their failure is, we believe, to be found in the fact, that they are not raised to their posts through such a vigorous competition as the Commissioners' scheme recommends. Indeed, it has sometimes happened, that men have been thrown into these situations as it were by mere accident, having had no training to fit them for the adequate discharge of their duties. Neither, as we have said, is there at present any provision for their being aided and stimulated by others, if in any department of their work they are found inefficient. The present wants of the Church call for the ablest, most earnest, and most influential instructors for the rising clergy. It is no injustice to the Divinity professors of Oxford, to say that, with the exception of Dr. Pusey, whom other reasons forbid us to praise, whatever ability and soundess they possess, not one of them has as yet succeeded in making his influence extensively felt. The time has passed when the Church can be satisfied with negative excellence. There are crises in society when what are called safe men are the most dangerous men in the world. We would not exclude such men from eminent posts in the University: it may even be right that they should hold the highest posts; but we protest against their having a monopoly of clerical instruction. There ought to be a fair-field and no favour. We repeat it — the most learned, able, and earnest religious men of the Church of England ought to be found amongst the instructors of its young clergy; and this cannot be effected without a much wider and freer competition than the present system allows.

Truly the Church of England requires at this moment a race of enlightened and energetic pastors, if it is rightly to fulfil its great work. We cannot conceive a more melancholy sight than that of a young clergyman from either University, trained in the present inefficient way — ordained as soon as he is of age — going down to some thickly-peopled district where he has to deal with intelligent mechanics, any one of whom is far more than his match in that sort of science which alone such persons appreciate, and far better acquainted than he is with the great social questions of the day. How will the young pastor's

knowledge of rubrics and a few antiquarian questions of theology enable him to grapple with Chartism and Socialism? Granted that there is a higher training required for a zealous pastor, which no University teaching can impart; but he does not gain from the University what we have a right to expect that it should give. Neither his meagre theology, nor his polite literature (of which probably, after all, if he is a young man of only average ability, he has a very slight sprinkling) will stand the shock of the unexpected conflict. Those whom the Church sends him to convince and instruct, have all the most powerful arguments against Christianity familiarly brought before them, from the cheap publications which retail to them the reasonings of Strauss and his school. But the young pastor knows neither the strength nor the weakness of such arguments; for the instructors at whose feet he has sat, have led him to suppose that they know as little on the subject as himself, usually teaching him to substitute a pious horror of all German books for a knowledge of their contents and a power of refuting their sophisms.

Would that the Church of England, the great bulwark in this age of Protestantism and of Christianity, knew its strength and the greatness of its mission. How goodly a foundation might the wholesome training of our Universities lay in a sound general education, if those who sit in their seats of honour would but raise the necessary superstructure. How far more powerful than any of the narrowly trained ministers of other denominations might the clergy of the Church of England be if the University did its duty by them. We do not deny that some of the young clergy are most intelligent and well read as well as zealous men; but these are so by their own efforts. The system of their University has given them no especial training for their work. We trust that not many months hence the professors, both of the theological and of every other faculty in our Universities, will be subjected to an unsparing reform.

But we weary our readers. The subject we have thought it right to bring forward is so comprehensive, that we must forbear. We will only once more express our confident hope that Lord John Russell's speech was the opening up of very thorough measures of educational improvement; and that the Government are now perfectly aware both of the magnitude of the task which lies before them, as bound to see that justice be done to all classes of the community in securing for them a good education, and also of the necessity for vigorous and speedy action in the accomplishment of this task. The poorest child in the streets and the son of the highest peer of the realm have

alike a right to demand that means be placed within their reach for learning in the best possible way to fulfil such duties as devolve on them in the body politic. And nothing will be found so effectual a cure for our social evils — nothing will, by God's blessing, so well unite the different parts of our social system and make them all work together for the country's good — as a vigorous determination on the part of our rulers to secure that it shall be their own fault if all are not well instructed and well trained. That statesman of our age will have the highest claim on the gratitude of posterity who shall have most forwarded the cause of an enlightened religious education in every class of rich and poor.

---

ART. VI. — 1. *Vanity Fair: a Novel without a Hero.* By WILLIAM MAKEPEACE THACKERAY. London: 1849.

2. *The History of Pendennis.* By WILLIAM MAKEPEACE THACKERAY. London: 1849.

3. *The History of Henry Esmond, a Colonel in the Service of Her Majesty Queen Anne.* Written by himself. London: 1853.

4. *The English Humourists of the Eighteenth Century: a Series of Lectures.* By WILLIAM MAKEPEACE THACKERAY. London: 1853.

WE had intended to review the whole of Mr. Thackeray's writings; but when we came to examine the twelve volumes which have been poured forth from the New York Press, and considered that they were only the forerunners of the three great novels which we have placed at the head of this Article, we felt that, if we attempted to criticise all, we must treat each superficially. We have resolved, therefore, to confine ourselves to the works on which Mr. Thackeray's fame really rests, and to leave Fitz-Boodle, and Barry Lyndon, and Men's Wives, and the Snobs, and the Yellow Plush Papers, and the Prize Novelists, and Mr. Brown's Letters, and Mr. Titmarsh's Travels, under the anonymous or pseudonymous veils in which their author thought fit to envelope them. We shall begin, therefore, with Vanity Fair.

We cannot tell what Mr. Thackeray's genius and diligence may still have in store for us; but of their numerous products up to the present time, Vanity Fair appears to us by far the best, the fullest of natural and amusing incident, and of characters with bold and firm outlines, and fine and con-

sistent details. It is called 'A Novel without a Hero;' and certainly, if a hero or a heroine be a person fitted to attract the affection or to rouse the admiration of the reader, if he or she is to be reverenced or to be adored, there is none such in Vanity Fair. There are, however, two marked figures which so far act the part of heroines as to be the props on which the whole tissue of the narrative is suspended, the centres which give to the plot the amount of unity which it possesses. These, of course, are Amelia and Becky. Their outward circumstances have much similarity. Each is born in middle life: they are educated at the same school; each marries, and, at the same time, a military man; each loses her husband, though not by similar causes, and is left with a single boy; each struggles with poverty; and each withdraws at the end of the story in affluence. An ordinary writer would have found it difficult to keep distinct characters so similar in their fortunes. In Mr. Thackeray's hands there the resemblance ends. In every other respect they are not merely different, but contrasted. One is the impersonation of virtue without intellect, the other that of intellect without virtue. One has no head, the other no heart.

Amelia Sedley is amiable by instinct. It is her nature to love all those with whom she comes in contact, just as it is the nature of a spaniel to caress every visitor. But her love, being founded on propinquity, not on judgment, is, like that of the spaniel, indiscriminating. She likes best those whom she has known longest, — her father, her mother, her husband, and her son, — and simply, as far as can be ascertained from their characters, *because* she has known them longest; for in themselves the first three are among the most unloveable specimens of this rich collection of deformities. The father is an ignorant, vulgar stock-broker, coarse and insolent in prosperity, and utterly beaten down by adversity. There are few passages in the work more highly finished than the interview between Sedley after his bankruptcy and his old *protégé* Captain Dobbin: —

'"I am very glad to see you, Captain Dobbin, Sir," said he, after a skulking look or two at his visitor. "How is the worthy alderman, and my lady, your excellent mother, Sir?" He looked round at the waiter as he said, "my lady," as much as to say, Hark ye, John, I have friends still, and persons of rank and reputation too. "My wife will be very happy to see her ladyship. I've a very kind letter here from your father, Sir, and beg my respectful compliments to him. Lady D—— will find us in rather a smaller house than we were accustomed to receive our friends in; but it's snug, and the change of air does good to my daughter, who was suffering in town rather—

you remember little Emmy, Sir? — Yes, suffering a good deal." The old gentleman's eyes were wandering as he spoke, and he was thinking of something else, as he sate thrumming on his papers and fumbling at the worn red tape.

'"You're a military man," he went on; "I ask you, Bill Dobbin, could any man ever have speculated upon the return of that Corsican scoundrel from Elba? When the allied sovereigns were here last year, and we gave 'em that dinner in the city, Sir, and we saw the Temple of Concord, and the fireworks, and the Chinese bridge in St. James's Park, could any sensible man suppose that peace wasn't really concluded, after we'd actually sung *Te Deum* for it, Sir? I ask you, William, could I suppose that the Emperor of Austria was a damned traitor — a traitor, and nothing more? I don't mince words — a double-faced infernal traitor and schemer, who meant to have his son-in-law back all along. And I say that the escape of Boney from Elba was a damned imposition and plot, Sir, in which half the powers of Europe were concerned, to bring the funds down, and to ruin this country. That's why I'm here, William. That's why my name 's in the Gazette. Why, Sir? — because I trusted the Emperor of Russia and the Prince Regent. Look here. Look at my papers. Look what the funds were on the 1st of March, — what the French fives were when I bought for the account, — and what they're at now. There was collusion, Sir, or that villain never would have escaped. Where was the English Commissioner who allowed him to get away? He ought to be shot, Sir, — brought to a court-martial, and shot, by Jove."

'"We're going to hunt Boney out, Sir," Dobbin said, rather alarmed at the fury of the old man, the veins of whose forehead began to swell, and who sate drumming his papers with his clenched fist. "We are going to hunt him out, Sir, — the Duke's in Belgium already, and we expect marching orders every day."

'"Give him no quarter. Bring back the villain's head, Sir. Shoot the coward down, Sir," Sedley roared. "I'd enlist myself, by ——; but I'm a broken old man — ruined by that damned scoundrel — and by a parcel of swindling thieves in this country whom I made, Sir, and who are rolling in their carriages now."' (Pp. 173, 174.)

Mr. Sedley is merely contemptible. His wife is equally contemptible, but, having a stronger will, is also odious. Mr. Thackeray has delightfully sketched her whole character in the scene in which she quarrels with Amelia for exclaiming that her child shall not be poisoned with Daffy's Elixir.

Mr. Thackeray adds:—

'Till the termination of her natural life, this breach between Mrs. Sedley and her daughter was never thoroughly mended. The quarrel gave the elder lady numberless advantages which she did not fail to turn to account with female ingenuity and perseverance. For instance, she scarcely spoke to Amelia for many weeks afterwards. She warned the domestics not to touch the child,

as Mrs. Osborne might be offended. She asked her daughter to see and satisfy herself that there was no poison prepared in the little daily messes that were concocted for Georgy. When neighbours asked after the boy's health, she referred them pointedly to Mrs. Osborne. She never ventured to ask whether the baby was well or not. *She* would not touch the child, although he was her grandson, and own precious darling, for she was not *used* to children and might kill it.' (P. 345.)

The person, however, who holds the first place in Amelia's heart is George Osborne, her husband. Mr. Thackeray has painted him at full length, with relentless truth and detail. He is first introduced to us as a young lieutenant, the accepted lover of Amelia, fond of her person, and pleased by her admiration, but ashamed of her family, and very much inclined to think that he is throwing himself away—that with his beauty and talents and expectations (his father is great in the tallow trade), he might aspire to something higher than a stock-broker's daughter. Then come three events simultaneously. He gets his company, Amelia is ruined, and she releases him from his engagement. He tries on his new uniform, and thinks it becomes him much; weeps over the trinkets and hair locket which she sends back to him; and tells Dobbin, with some despondency, that 'all is over between them.'

Dobbin, however, disapproves of his friend's easy acquiescence, carries him back to his betrothed, and never leaves him until the knot has been tied, and the new couple are on their road to Brighton.

One of the most powerful portraits in the work is that of old Osborne, George's father. If it have a defect, it is that it is too uniformly black. It is made up of arrogance, vanity, malignity, vindictiveness, ingratitude; in short, of all the bad passions and bad tendencies that are capable of coexistence. Of course he disapproves of the match, and notifies to George that he has nothing to expect, except what he cannot be deprived of, a couple of thousand pounds, his share of his mother's fortune.

These are the comments of the bridegroom in the first week of his honeymoon:—

'"A pretty way you have managed the affair," said George, looking savagely at William Dobbin. "Look there, Dobbin," and he flung over to the latter his parent's letter. "A beggar, by Jove, and all in consequence of my d——d sentimentality. Why couldn't we have waited? A ball might have done for me in the course of the war, and may still, and how will Emmy be bettered by being left a beggar's widow? It was all your doing. You were never easy until you had got me married and ruined. What the deuce am I to

do with two thousand pounds? Such a sum won't last two years. I've lost a hundred and forty to Crawley at cards and billiards since I've been down here. A pretty manager of a man's matters *you* are, forsooth. Do you suppose a man of my habits can live on his pay and a hundred a year? How the deuce am I to keep up my position in the world upon such a pitiful pittance? I can't change my habits. I *must* have my comforts. I wasn't brought up on porridge like Mac Whirter, or on potatoes like old O'Dowd. Do you expect my wife to take in soldier's washing, or ride after the regiment in a baggage waggon?"' (P. 211.)

The regiment is ordered abroad, and the scene changes to Brussels. George neglects his bride, wastes in a few weeks the little capital which was to have been her only support, tries to seduce her friend, hurries from the Duchess of Richmond's celebrated ball to Quatre Bras, and dies at Waterloo.

The amiable ridiculous character in the drama is Dobbin; and one of his absurdities is, that at first sight, and knowing that she is engaged to his friend George, he falls in love with Amelia. Year after year, during her widowhood, he urges his suit—but in vain. Her heart is filled by the recollection of 'that departed saint,' her husband. At length it suits Becky that Amelia should marry, and thus she effects her purpose.

'"Listen to me, Amelia," said Becky, marching up and down the room before the other, and surveying her with a sort of contemptuous kindness. "I want to talk to you. You are no more fit to live in the world than a baby in arms. You must marry, or you and your precious boy will go to ruin—you must have a husband, you fool; and one of the best gentlemen I ever saw has offered to you a hundred times."

'"I tried —, I tried my best, indeed I did, Rebecca," said Amelia deprecatingly, "but I could not forget ——," and she looked up at George's portrait.

'"Could not forget him," cried Becky; "that selfish humbug, that low-bred cockney dandy, that padded booby, who had neither wit, nor manners, nor heart.—Why, the man would have jilted you, but that Dobbin made him keep his word. He never cared for you. He used to sneer about you to me time after time, and made love to me the week after he married you."

'"It's false! It's false!" said Amelia, starting up.

'"Look there, you fool," Becky said, still with provoking good humour, and taking a little paper out of her belt flung it into Amelia's lap. "You know his hand-writing; he wrote that to me,—wanted me to run away with him,—gave it to me under your nose the day before he was shot,—and served him right," Becky repeated.' (Pp. 618, 619.)

Amelia, as usual, obeys, and marries Dobbin a week after.

Amelia's boy is one of the least marked characters. Indeed

it is difficult to make a child attractive, except in tragedy. Mamilius, Arthur, Edward the Fifth, and his brother affect us, but it is because we contrast their happy childish prattle with the dark fate that is soon to swallow them up. If they had been destined to a long and happy life, we should have been wearied by them. Again, the youth of a very remarkable man, of Rousseau, for instance, or of Southey, is instructive, both as it shows the dawn of an intellect that was to shine so brightly, and as it enables us to trace many of the moral excellences and defects of the adult to the training of the child. But this can be done only in an autobiography. Such a narrative loses its merit with its reality. Who can read the Emile?

Now as little Osborne was intended for wealth and prosperity, he could not be made interesting by contrast, and Mr. Thackeray has prudently sketched him in rather indistinct colours, as a handsome, commonplace, spoiled boy, likely when he should come of age to spend a fortune, but certainly not to earn one.

Such are the objects of Amelia's affections. As to her actions, few of them are really hers. She generally obeys, without preference and without reluctance, the impulse given to her by those immediately around her. In obedience to her parents she falls in love with George Osborne; by her father's orders she dismisses him; at her mother's bidding she resumes him. The only act in which she exhibits free-will is the surrender of her son to his grandfather. The struggle which she goes through, the feelings which alternately impel and restrain her, are described with exquisite skill.

The evils and the dangers of such a surrender were scarcely capable of exaggeration. To give up a child of ten years old to the absolute management of a stranger is a frightful risk, even if that stranger were a Fenelon. To give it up to a coarse, uneducated, violent old man; to expose it to be crushed by his tyranny, and spoiled by his indulgence; to throw into its path the temptations of both wealth and poverty, those which rouse into insolence, and those which degrade into servility — these are chances from which a sensible mother would have recoiled. No hopes of wealth or grandeur; no fears, except that of absolute starvation, would have induced her to incur them.

But these are *not* the motives which influence Amelia. They do not even occur to her:—as far as the boy is concerned, she sees nothing in Mr. Osborne's offers but wealth, station, and education. Yet she rejects those offers with indignation.

'She was never,' says our author, 'seen angry but twice or thrice in her life, and it was in one of these moods that Mr. Osborne's attorney had the good fortune to behold her. She rose up trembling and flushing, and tore the letter into a hundred fragments. "*I* take money to part from my child! Who dares insult me by proposing such a thing? Tell Mr. Osborne that it is a cowardly letter, Sir, — a cowardly letter;—I will not answer it.—I wish you good morning, Sir,"—and she bowed me out of the room like a tragedy queen, said the lawyer who told the story.' (P. 413.)

The cause of all this anger is simply the selfish feeling that she cannot bear to lose the society of her son. Poverty, however, comes on her like an armed man; every resource fails, and she 'tries in vain to hide from herself the thought which 'will return to her, that she ought to part with the boy, that 'she is the only barrier between him and prosperity. She 'can't, she can't,—not now at least. Oh, it is too hard to think 'of and to bear.' (P. 442.)

At length she submits. 'The sentence is passed,—the child 'must go from her to others,—to forget her. Her heart, her 'treasure,—her hope, joy, love, worship,—she must give him 'up.' (P. 443.)

The boy is given over to his grandfather; but some of the evils that were to be expected do not follow. Old Osborne has become somewhat mellowed by age and infirmity. Georgy suffers not from his severity, but from his fondness. Every stimulant is applied to his vanity, his imperiousness, and his self-indulgence. 'How he du damn and swear,' the servants say, delighted by his precocity. He grows up domineering, conceited, and selfish. But the feebleness of mind which prevented his mother's anticipating these results, prevents her perceiving them. She believes him to be perfect, or, what in her eyes is the same, to be his father over again.

The reader will have inferred, from the attention which we have paid to the character of Amelia, that we think it a creation of extraordinary skill. We do so. It appears to us to unite the two greatest merits that a fictitious character can possess,—originality and nature. And yet it is the source of one of the greatest blemishes of the work. Mr. Thackeray indulges in the bad practice of commenting on the conduct of his *dramatis personæ*. He is perpetually pointing out to us the generosity of Dobbin, the brutality of the Osbornes, the vanity of Joseph Sedley, and so on, instead of leaving us to find out their qualities from their actions. And in the course of this running commentary he keeps repeating that Amelia was adorable; that she was the idol of all who approached her, and deserved to be

so; in short, that she was the perfection of womanhood. Now we will not deny that she had qualities which would make her agreeable as a plaything, and useful as a slave; but playthings or slaves are not what men look for in wives. They want partners of their cares, counsellors in their perplexities, aids in their enterprises, and companions in their pursuits. To represent a pretty face, an affectionate disposition, and a weak intellect as together constituting the most attractive of women, is a libel on both sexes.

We must now take up Amelia's pendant, Becky: the character, among all that Mr. Thackeray has drawn, which has received the most applause.

When we said that she was the impersonation of intellect without virtue, we used the word virtue in perhaps too narrow a sense, as indicating the qualities which we love, the qualities which arise from the sympathy of their possessor with others, and therefore occasion *them* to sympathise with him. Now, of these qualities Becky is devoid. She has no affection, no pity, no disinterested benevolence. She is indeed perfectly selfish. She wants all the virtues which are to be exercised for the benefit of others. She has neither justice nor veracity. She treats mankind as mankind treats the brutes, as mere sources of utility or amusement, as instruments, or playthings, or prey. But many of the self-regarding virtues she possesses in a high degree. She has great industry, prudence, decision, courage, and self-reliance. These are the qualities which, when under the direction of a powerful intellect, unbiassed by sympathies, and unrestrained by scruples, have produced many of the masters of mankind. In a higher sphere Becky might have been a Semiramis or a Catherine. As might be expected in a person of her good sense and self-control, she is mistress of the smaller virtues, good temper and good nature; she always wishes to please, because it is only by pleasing that she can subjugate. She is not resentful or spiteful, because she despises those around her too much to waste anger on them, and because she knows that petty injuries are generally repaid with interest. Her estimate of herself is not far from the truth. She is visiting at a sober country-house, in which she formerly lived as a governess.

'One day followed another, and the ladies of the house passed their life in those calm pursuits and amusements which satisfy country ladies. Rebecca sung Handel and Haydn to the family of evenings, and engaged in a large piece of worsted work, as if she had been born to the business, and as if this kind of life was to continue with her until she should sink to the grave in a polite old age, leaving regrets

and a great quantity of consols behind her, — as if there were not cares and duns, schemes, shifts, and poverty waiting outside the Park gates to pounce upon her when she issued into the world again.

'"It isn't difficult to be a country gentleman's wife," Rebecca thought; "I think I could be a good woman if I had five thousand a-year. I could dawdle about in the nursery, and count the apricots on the wall. I could water plants in a green-house, and pick off dead leaves from the geraniums; I could ask old women about their rheumatisms, and order half-a-crown's worth of soup for the poor; I shouldn't miss it much out of five thousand a-year. I could go to church and keep awake in the great family pew: or go to sleep behind the curtains, and with my veil down, if I only had practice. I could pay everybody if I had but the money."'

'The old haunts, the old fields and woods, the copses, ponds, and gardens, the rooms of the old house where she had spent a couple of years seven years ago, were all carefully revisited by her. She had been young then, or comparatively so, for she forgot the time when she ever *was* young, — but she remembered her thoughts and feelings seven years back, and contrasted them with those which she had at present, now that she had seen the world and lived with great people, and raised herself far beyond her original humble station.

'"I have passed beyond it because I have brains," Becky thought, "and almost all the rest of the world are fools. I could not go back and consort with those people now, whom I used to meet in my father's studio. Lords come up to my door with stars and garters, instead of poor artists with screws of tobacco in their pockets. I have a gentleman for my husband, and an Earl's daughter for my sister, in the very house where I was little better than a servant a few years ago. But am I much better to do now in the world than I was when I was the poor painter's daughter, and wheedled the grocer round the corner for sugar and tea? Suppose I had married Francis, who was so fond of me, I couldn't have been much poorer than I am now. Heigho! I wish I could exchange my position in society, and all my relations for a snug run in the three per cent. consols." For so it was that Becky felt the Vanity of human affairs, and it was in those securities that she would have liked to cast anchor.' (Pp. 376, 377.)

The game which poor Becky plays is, from its outset, almost a hopeless one: it is, to rise in the world without money, or birth, or connexions, or friends. She begins it at seventeen; the orphan, penniless daughter of a drunken, unsuccessful painter and a French opera girl. Received as a French teacher in Miss Pinkerton's school, bored by the pompous vanity of the mistress, the silly chat and scandal and quarrels of the girls, and the frigid, empty correctness of the governesses, she forms her habits of unsympathising self-existence. She fights her way to be a governess in Sir Pitt Crawley's family; and, by a mixture of wheedling, coaxing, flattering, and rallying (described with as much humour as it is conceived), hooks and plays with, and at

length lands, her first spoil, Captain Rawdon Crawley. Her prize, however, resembles the gold paid by the magician in the Arabian Nights, which turned to leaves in the receiver's purse. Crawley's aunt, disgusted by his match, burns a will under which he was to have inherited 50,000*l.*; and Becky finds that all that she has gained is a good-natured husband, overwhelmed with debt, with no property but his commission in the Life Guards, and no knowledge except of whist, piquette, and billiards. With her usual good sense, she makes the most of her unpromising cards—goes with the regiment to Brussels—turns the general commanding the division into her slave—provides victims for the admirable play of her husband—and makes him the happiest of mortals.

'She had mastered this rude coarse nature, and he loved and worshipped her with all his faculties of regard and admiration. In all his life he had never been so happy as, during the past few months, his wife had made him. She had known perpetually how to divert him, and he had found his house and her society a thousand times more pleasant than any place or company which he had ever frequented from his childhood until now. And he cursed his past follies and extravagances, and bemoaned his vast outlying debts, which must remain for ever as obstacles to prevent his wife's advance.

'Rebecca always knew how to conjure away these moods of melancholy. "Why, my stupid love," she would say, "we have not done with your aunt yet. If she fails us, isn't there what you call the Gazette? or, stop, when your uncle Bute's life drops, I have another scheme. The living always belonged to the youngest brother, and why shouldn't you sell out and go into the Church?" The idea of this conversion set Rawdon into roars of laughter; you might have heard the explosion through the hotel at midnight. General Tufts heard it from his quarters in the first floor; and Rebecca acted the scene with great spirit, and preached Rawdon's first sermon, to the immense delight of the General at breakfast.' (Pp. 258, 259.)

The night before Quatre Bras comes. Three partings are described. The first is that between Amelia and George Osborne.

'On arriving at his quarters from the ball, George found his regimental servant already making preparations for his departure; the man had understood his signal to be still, and these arrangements were very quickly and silently made. Should he go in and wake Amelia, he thought, or leave a note for her brother to break the news of departure to her? He went to look at her once again.

'She had been awake when he first entered her room, but had kept her eyes closed, so that even her wakefulness should not seem to reproach him. But when he had returned, so soon after herself, too, this timid little heart had felt more at ease, and, turning towards him as he stept softly out of the room, she had fallen into a light sleep.

'He came to the bed-side, and looked at the hand, the little soft hand, lying asleep: and he bent over the pillow noiselessly towards the gentle pale face.

'Two fair arms closed tenderly round his neck as he stooped down. "I am awake, George," the poor child said, with a sob fit to break the little heart that nestled so closely by his own. She was awake, poor soul, and to what? At that moment a bugle from the Place of Arms began sounding clearly, and was taken up through the town; and amidst the drums of the infantry, and the shrill pipes of the Scotch, the whole city awoke.' (P. 256.)

The next is between Major O'Dowd, who commands the regiment, and his wife.

'"I'd like ye wake me about half an hour before the assembly beats," the Major said to his lady. "Call me at half-past one, Peggy, dear, and see me things is ready. May be I'll not come back to breakfast, Mrs. O'D." With which words, the Major ceased talking, and fell asleep.

'Mrs. O'Dowd, the good housewife, arrayed in curl papers and a camisole, felt that her duty was to act, and not to sleep, at this juncture. "Time enough for that," she said, "when Mick's gone;" and so she packed his travelling-valise ready for the march, brushed his cloak, his cap, and other warlike habiliments, set them out in order for him; and stowed away in the cloak pockets a light package of portable refreshments, and a wicker covered flask or pocket-pistol, containing near a pint of a remarkably sound Cognac brandy, of which she and the Major approved very much, and as soon as the hands of the "repaythers" pointed to half-past one, and its interior arrangements (it had a tone quite equal to a cathay-dral its fair owner considered) knelled forth that fatal hour, Mrs. O'Dowd woke up her Major, and had as comfortable a cup of coffee prepared for him as any made that morning in Brussels.' (Pp. 257, 258.)

Last comes that of the Crawleys.

'Rebecca, as we have said, wisely determined not to give way to unavailing sentimentality on her husband's departure. She waved him an adieu from the window, and stood there for a moment looking out after he was gone. The cathedral towers and the full gables of the quaint old houses were just beginning to blush in the sunrise. There had been no rest for her that night. She was still in her pretty ball dress, her fair hair hanging somewhat out of curl on her neck, and the circles round her eyes dark with watching. "What a fright I seem," she said, examining herself in the glass, "and how pale this pink makes one look!" So she divested herself of this pink raiment; in doing which a note fell out from her corsage, which she picked up with a smile, and locked into her dressing-box. And then she put her bouquet of the ball into a glass of water, and went to bed, and slept very comfortably.

'The town was quite quiet when she woke up at ten o'clock, and

partook of coffee, very requisite and comfortable after the exhaustion and grief of the morning's occurrences.

'This meal over, she surveyed her position. Should the worst befal, all things considered, she was pretty well to do. There were her own trinkets and trousseau, in addition to those which her husband had left behind. Besides these, and the little mare, the General, her slave and worshipper, had made her many very handsome presents, in the shape of cashmere shawls bought at the auction of a bankrupt French general's lady, and numerous tributes from the jewellers' shops, all of which betokened her admirer's taste and wealth.

'Every calculation made of these valuables, Mrs. Rebecca found, not without a pungent feeling of triumph and self-satisfaction, that should circumstances occur, she might reckon on six or seven hundred pounds, at the very least, to begin the world with: and she passed the morning disposing, ordering, looking out, and locking up her properties in the most agreeable manner. If this is a novel without a hero, at least let us lay claim to a heroine. No man in the British army which has marched away, not the great duke himself, could be more cool or collected in the presence of doubts and difficulties, than the indomitable little aide-de-camp's wife.' (Pp. 260, 261, 262.)

In a year or two we find Becky in London, having achieved the perilous enterprise of scaling the heights of fashion; but she finds them neither secure nor amusing.

'Becky's former acquaintances hated and envied her: the poor woman herself was yawning in spirit. "I wish I were out of it," she said to herself. "I would rather be a parson's wife, and teach a Sunday School, than this; or a sergeant's lady and ride in the regimental waggon; or O! how much gayer it would be to wear spangles and trousers, and dance before a booth at a fair."

'"You would do it very well," said Lord Steyne, laughing. She used to tell the great man her *ennuis* and perplexities in her artless way—they amused him.

'In her commerce with the great, our dear friend showed the same frankness which distinguished her transactions with the lowly in station. On one occasion, when out at a very fine house, Rebecca was (perhaps rather ostentatiously) holding a conversation in the French language with a celebrated tenor singer of that nation, while the Lady Grizzel Macbeth looked over her shoulder scowling at the pair.

'"How very well you speak French," Lady Grizzel said, who herself spoke the tongue in an Edinburgh accent most remarkable to hear. "I ought to know it," Becky modestly said, casting down her eyes. "I taught it in a school, and my mother was a Frenchwoman."

'Lady Grizzel was won by her humility, and was mollified towards the little woman. She deplored the fatal levelling tendencies of the age, which admitted persons of all classes into the society of

their superiors; but her ladyship owned, that this one at least was well behaved, and never forgot her place in life.

'How the Crawleys got the money which was spent upon the entertainments with which they treated the polite world, was a mystery which gave rise to some conversation at the time, and probably added zest to these little festivities. Who knows what stories were or were not told of our dear and innocent friend? Certain it is, that if she had had all the money which she was said to have begged, or borrowed, or stolen, she might have capitalised and been honest for life, whereas,—but this is advancing matters. The truth is, that by economy and good management—by a sparing use of ready money, and by paying scarcely anybody—people can manage, for a time at least, to make a great show with very little means: and it is our belief, that Becky's much-talked-of parties, which were not, after all that was said, very numerous, cost this lady very little more than the wax candles which lighted the walls. Stillbrook supplied her with game and fruit in abundance. Lord Steyne's cellar was at her disposal, and that excellent nobleman's famous cooks presided over her little kitchen, or sent by my lord's order the rarest delicacies from their own. I protest it is quite shameful in the world to abuse a simple creature, as people of her time abuse Becky, and I warn the public against believing one-tenth of the stories against her.' (Pp. 453, 454, 455.)

If Becky could have changed sexes with her husband, all would have gone well. She might have canvassed a borough as a Radical, and a county as a Tory—might have gained the ear of the House by malignity, and kept it by effrontery—might have risen into notoriety by attacking the first men of the age, and have become the leader of a party by joining one which all persons of sense had deserted. But she is a woman; she can establish herself only through her husband; and her husband has neither talents, nor knowledge, nor character. Her only resource is to treat him as damaged goods generally are treated—to export him to the colonies. It is an awful job; but her friend Lord Steyne is all-powerful. Such things, however, are not to be got for nothing, and poor Becky has only one means of paying for them.

Unhappily, on the very night that the gazette is being printed which announces that His Majesty has been pleased to appoint Colonel Crawley, C.B., to be the Governor of Coventry Island, Crawley discovers what was the nature of the contract by which his preferment was obtained. He knocks down his patron, publishes his wife's shame, separates himself from her for ever, and goes out to administer Swamp Town.

Mr. Thackeray has not made Becky's downward course as entertaining as her rise. Indeed, it was impossible. No series of events can amuse, or, what is a much easier thing, can interest,

unless we can sympathise in some respects with the principal agent. Even in tragedy, the most atrocious villain is generally invested by the poet with some qualities which we admire and even love. Richard the Third, Iago, and Lovelace, perhaps the most hateful of poetical heroes, possess in the highest degree wit, sagacity, courage, and decision. Tears, such as angels weep, burst forth from Satan. Now, in Becky's earlier career, though there was more to hate, there was much to admire, and something to like. The reader thoroughly sympathised with her scorn of fools, however highly placed; with the intrepidity with which she encountered insolence, and the dexterity with which she repelled it; with her spirit in danger, her resources in difficulty, and the gay vivacity which was spread like sunshine over her whole demeanour. He was amused even by the impudence of her vanity, and the breadth and boldness of her mendacity. It is difficult to avoid sympathising with the success of schemes so magnificently planned and so audaciously carried out. It is not Fortune alone that favours the bold. All the world follows Fortune's example.

But with her success all the charm of Becky disappears. Even Mr. Thackeray turns his back upon her. He no longer supplies her with the sagacity and presence of mind which carried her triumphantly through the storms and among the quicksands of her London life. He allows her to sink from degradation to degradation, without an effort on his part, or even on hers, to extricate her, until she loses her identity, and the brilliant Rebecca turns into a vulgar swindler. At length, he seems to relent, and to take pity on the distresses of an old acquaintance who has afforded so much amusement. He throws Amelia and her brother across her path, and gives up to her the rich Joseph as a prey. And here we think her changes ought to have ended. As the ruler, and, as soon as the climate of Coventry Island rendered her a widow, the wife, of Joseph Sedley, she might have passed the tranquil, decorous middle age to which he at length dismisses her, — 'busied in works of piety; going to 'church, and never without a footman; the subscriber to every 'charity; the fast friend of the destitute orange girl, the neg-'lected washerwoman, and the distressed muffinman; a pa-'troness and stall-keeper in every benevolent bazaar in Chel-'tenham and Bath.' Instead of this, he blackens her with the vulgar commonplace crimes of making Sedley's will in her favour, insuring his life, and poisoning him.

This we venture to think a mistake. Comic characters are intended to amuse, not to frighten. They may be as vicious as the author pleases; they may be utterly heartless, they may

swindle, they may rob; but they must not kill. The extent to which tragi-comedy is allowable may be undefined; but this we think is clear, namely, that the comedy must be an accessory to the tragedy, not the tragedy to the comedy. The intermixture of a few cheerful spots among gloomy or frightful scenes is felt as a relief. The intrusion of the terrible among gay images is an interruption. It is like a gibbet as the background of a Watteau. We are pleased to enjoy a respite from the continued contemplation of suffering or danger. We are shocked at being disturbed in our laughter by wailings and screams. All Shakspeare's tragedies have a mixture of comedy; none of his comedies contain any thing that is tragic. Hotspur, Henry the Fifth, and Richard are tragic. Their powers for good and for evil are gigantic; the fate of kingdoms depends on them. They can afford to trifle; their wit and humour, though sometimes pushed to buffoonery, does not lower them. Richard may smile, because he can murder while he smiles. But what should we think of Shakspeare if he had made Falstaff an assassin, or had engaged Shallow, Slender, and Poins in a murderous conspiracy? Hatred is to most men a painful emotion. There are undoubtedly torpid dispositions which require strong excitement, which enjoy pictures of murderers, tyrants, and oppressors just as they enjoy the taste of garlic, and the smell of tobacco; but these coarse intellectual palates are rare. In most minds the indignation produced by the description of great crimes requires to be soothed by the exemplary punishment of the offender, or to be diverted by withdrawing from him the reader's attention, and fixing it on the heroism of the sufferer, on the courage with which he resists violence, or on the patience with which he bears it. But these are the materials of tragedy; and when they are introduced into a work of which the basis is comic, they recall us painfully from the sunny scenes among which we have been wandering to the gloomy regions of danger and endurance.

Though we have left more than half the characters in Vanity Fair unnoticed, our review of it has extended to almost an unwarrantable length. Our defence is, that we have been reviewing one of the most remarkable books of this age—a work which is as sure of immortality as ninety-nine hundredths of modern novels are sure of annihilation.

Pendennis has generally been thought inferior to Vanity Fair, and we are not inclined to dispute the verdict of the public. It wants the grand historical background of Vanity Fair. Mr. Thackeray never was more happily inspired than when he removed his theatre to Belgium. Every reader will admit that

the events in Brussels are those which are the most strongly imprinted on his memory. Every one recollects, as well as if he had witnessed them, the perplexities of Lady Bareacres, the undaunted self-possession of Becky, and the terrors of Joseph Sedley. But it is not merely to the exquisite truth with which these scenes are imagined that they owe their apparent reality. The solid foundation of fact by which all that is invention is supported, gives to it a stability which no pure fictions can possess. We know that thousands must have been startled at their mid-day meal, like Sedley and Mrs. O'Dowd by the dull distant mutterings of Quatre Bras. We know that tens of thousands felt Amelia's terrors when the cannon of Waterloo began to roar. Every Scotchman who visited the British Institution last year, and admired Drummond's charming picture of John Knox bringing home his second wife, felt what probability was given to its imaginary details by the curious gable ends and projecting windows and outside staircase of the still existing house at the head of the Netherbow, which the serious bridal procession is reaching.

It has been objected to the historical novel that it carries untruth on the face of it. First, because we already know all that can be known of the departed great, and feel that any additional actions or speeches must be attributed to them falsely. And secondly, because the reader has always formed to himself a conception of the language and conduct of every historical person in whom he is interested, and is disgusted when the author's conception of them differs, as it almost always must, from his own.

There is much foundation for these objections, and Mr. Thackeray, in Vanity Fair, has skilfully avoided them, by excluding from his novel historical characters, though he admits historical events. He has not given us a sketch, or even a side view, of any actor in the great drama of 1815, whose name was ever heard of before. Isidor and Pauline, and the O'Dowds and Regulus, are all the delightful creations of the author. But we know that there must have been such persons in Brussels in June 1815, that they must have witnessed the wonders of that memorable month, and that they must have talked and acted in the same manner, though not quite so amusingly, as their representatives are made to do in the pages of Vanity Fair. Now all this is wanting in Pendennis. As far as can be inferred from any historical allusions, it might have been written at any time during the present, or indeed during the last century. The old and the young, the Londoners and the provincials, all act and talk as if the fortunes of the country had no con-

nexion with theirs. Even the professional writers deal with politics with the impartiality of indifference. They put one in mind of Chatterton's computation on a great man's death. 'Lost by not being able to dedicate to him, ten guineas. 'Gained by writing his life, 12*l*. Am glad he is dead, by 'thirty shillings.'

Pendennis is further distinguished from Vanity Fair by possessing a hero. Arthur Pendennis, who fills that office, is the only child of a retired apothecary, of an old but reduced family. He loses his father at sixteen, and from that time is educated, or rather supported, under the care of a weak, affectionate mother, one of the tender, generous incapables whom Mr. Thackeray delights in painting, because he paints them well. He lives at home with her and a nominal tutor; falls in love with an actress, who jilts him when she finds that he has nothing in possession, and only 500*l*. a year in prospect; and is removed to the University, where he becomes a fast young man, runs in debt, and is plucked. He retires to his native village, lives idly with his mother and his cousin (the good heroine of the piece), after some love passages, takes refuge in the Temple as a law-student, is disgusted by the study, and adopts literature as a profession. He succeeds as a magazine writer, novelist, and minor poet; and partly as a *littérateur*, and partly through the patronage of his uncle, an antiquated beau, gets admission into the world of fashion. His mother's death puts him in possession of his patrimony, and after some more abortive love-making he marries his cousin, and settles in the country.

Along this not very interesting biography is strung a garland of portraits and incidents, conceived with Mr. Thackeray's wonderful fertility of invention, and executed with his equally wonderful mastery of outline and colour.

One of the most amusing of these portraits is the actress, Pendennis's juvenile flame — Miss Costigan, or, to use her *nom de théâtre*, the Fotheringay. Mr. Thackeray gives to her a splendid person,—after the model of Gibson's Puella Capuana, whom indeed she resembles intellectually,—industry, good sense, and good tendencies, but absolutely no imagination, and therefore the torpidity of feeling which generally follows from that defect. She has taken to the stage as the best means of supporting herself and her drunken Irish father; accepts blindly the instructions of one Bows, a clever dramatic teacher, the leader of the orchestra; practises them with unremitting diligence, and becomes, in the parts which she has thus studied, a fine actress from pure memory. The courtship is eminently

entertaining; but still more so its conclusion, when Captain Costigan discovers and exposes to his daughter the real circumstances of Pendennis.

The interlocutors are the father and daughter and Bows, a hump-backed little old man, who, it must be recollected, is himself in love with the Fotheringay.

'"O Emilee!" cried the Captain, "that boy whom I loved as the boy of mee bosom is only a scoundthrel, and a deceiver, mee poor girl:" and he looked in the most tragical way at Mr. Bows, opposite; who, in his turn, gazed somewhat anxiously at Miss Costigan.

'"He! pooh! Sure the poor lad's as simple as a schoolboy," she said. "All them children write verses and nonsense."

'"He's been acting the part of a viper to this fireside, and a traitor in this familee," cried the Captain. "I tell ye he's no better then an impostor."

'"What has the poor fellow done, papa?" asked Emily.

'"Done? He has deceived me in the most athrocious manner," Miss Emily's papa said. "He has trifled with your affections, and outraged my own fine feelings. He has represented himself as a man of property, and it tuoruns out that he is no betther than a beggar. Haven't I often told ye he had two thousand a year? He's a pauper, I tell ye, Miss Costigan: a depindent upon the bountee of his mother, a good woman, who may marry again, who's likely to live for ever, and who has but five hundred a year."

'Milly looked very grave and thoughtful, rubbing with bread crumb a pair of ex-white satin shoes, intending to go mad upon them next Tuesday in Ophelia. "Sure if he's no money, there's no use marrying him, papa," she said sententiously.

'"Why did the villain say he was a man of prawpertee?" asked Costigan.

'"The poor fellow always said he was poor," answered the girl. "'Twas you would have it he was rich, papa,—and made me agree to take him."

'"He should have been explicit and told us his income, Milly," answered the father. "A young fellow who rides a blood mare, and makes presents of shawls and bracelets, is an impostor if he has no money."

'"And so poor Arthur has no money?" sighed out Miss Costigan, rather plaintively. "Poor lad, he was a good lad too: wild and talking nonsense, with his verses and pothry and that, but a brave, generous boy, and indeed I liked him — and he liked me too," she added, rather softly, and rubbing away at the shoe.

'"Why don't you marry him if you like him so?" Mr. Bows said, rather savagely. "He is not more than ten years younger than you are. His mother may relent, and you might go and live and have enough at Fairoaks Park. Why not go and be a lady? I could go on with the fiddle, and the General live on his half-pay. Why don't you marry him? You know he likes you."

'"There's others that likes me as well, Bows, that has no money, and that's old enough," Miss Milly said.

'"Yes, d—— it," said Bows, with a bitter curse — "that are old enough and poor enough and fools enough for anything."

'"There's old fools, and young fools too. You've often said so, you silly man," the imperious beauty said, with a conscious glance at the old gentleman. "If Pendennis has not enough money to live upon, it's folly to talk about marrying him: and that's the long and short of it."' (Vol. i. pp. 109, 110, 111.)

The contrast between the humdrum Miss Costigan and the impassioned Fotheringay is most amusing; but in justice to the charming profession to which she belongs, we feel bound to express some doubt whether really fine acting can be the result of mere memory and unintelligent imitation. There are indeed great authorities in Mr. Thackeray's favour. Johnson said of Pritchard, that she was a vulgar idiot, that her playing was quite mechanical, and that she no more thought of reading the play out of which her part was taken than a shoemaker thinks of the skin out of which the piece of leather of which he is making a pair of shoes is cut. And Diderot has written an essay to prove that perfect self-possession and cold insensibility to the emotions which he represents are essential to a great actor. 'Such an actor,' he says, 'is the same in every representa-'tion, and always equally perfect. All is prepared, all is learned 'by heart. His passion has its beginning, its middle, and its 'end. The same accents, the same positions, the same gestures 'are repeated. If there be any difference, the last representa-'tion, being the most studied, is the best. 'You ask me,' he continues, 'whether these plaintive tones, these half-stifled 'sobs, in which a despairing mother seems to pour forth her 'inmost soul, can be the result of no real emotion? Un-'questionably, I answer; and the proof is, that they form 'part of a system of declamation—that they have been ela-'borated by long study—that to be properly uttered they 'have been repeated a hundred times—that every time the 'actor listened to his own voice—that he is listening to it now '—and that his skill consists not in feeling an emotion, but in 'imitating its external signs. Those screams of grief are noted 'in his memory; those gestures of despair have been laboriously 'prepared. He has fixed in his own mind the precise time 'when he is to weep. This trembling voice, these half-uttered, 'half-stifled words, these quivering limbs, these trembling knees '—all is pure memory, a lesson carefully learned and accu-'rately repeated; a sublime deception, which the actor knows 'to be a deception while he is executing it; which wearies his

'body, but does not disturb his mind.'—*Correspondance Littéraire de Grimmet Diderot*, Oct. 1770.

It must be remembered, however, that a French tragedy differs essentially from the dramatic representation which goes by that name in England. So much so, that in the essay from which we have been quoting, Diderot admits that a man who can act Shakspeare perfectly, is in all probability absolutely incapable of rendering Racine, 'ne sait pas le premier mot de 'la déclamation d'une scène de Racine.' It is probable that things so different as French and English acting may require different habits of mind, and different modes of study and execution; and that the long tirades of Phédre may be best declaimed by an actor who is really indifferent, and merely simulates passion, while the rapid natural dialogue of Shakspeare must be felt in order to be adequately expressed. And absolutely without denying the possibility of the mechanical acting of Pritchard and Miss Costigan, we must affirm also the compatibility of the deepest real emotion with the most vivid representation of it. Every one who had the happiness to be in the stage box when Jenny Lind pulled to pieces the rose in the Sonnambula, saw real tears running down her cheeks. And it is known that she declared that when on the stage she never saw the audience, and that if she ever thought of their presence it spoiled the truth of her acting. All the great performers that occur to our recollection have enjoyed the dangerous privileges, and have been subject to the painful joys, of the poetic temperament.

One of the most finished portraits is that of the gentlemanlike parasite Major Pendennis. Perhaps we ought rather to call him a tuft-hunter than a parasite. That word is generally used to signify a man who fawns on the rich for a subsistence. Now this Major Pendennis does not. His object is not a subsistence, the means which he uses are not fawning, nor is mere money the object of his adoration. He despises vulgar untitled opulence as much as he does vulgar untitled genius. His idol is not wealth, but fashion. To a certain extent his worship is disinterested; that is to say, it is paid to his patrons for their own sakes. He desires from them no favour except to be received into their society. He suns himself in the eyes of a man of fashion like a lover in those of his mistress. This state of feeling, familiar as it is to us, seems to have been unknown to the Greeks and to the Romans. The classical parasite was in search of something solid. He cringed for a dinner or a sportula, and cared little for the degradation by which he obtained them. Gross flattery was his readiest instrument, and as that was most palatable to the vulgarest minds, the vulgarest

of the rich were those to whom he was most desirous to pay court.

The objects of the modern tuft-hunter are less substantial. The values for which he barters his independence are, to use the language of political economy, immaterial. Familiarity with the great is, with him, not the means but the end. All that he asks from them is their acquaintance. All the use that he makes of the acquaintance of one is to serve as a passport to that of another. In a society so vast and so changing as that of the English aristocracy, this pursuit, when adopted by a man who begins from the bottom, has the great advantage of being inexhaustible. He may grow old, as Major Pendennis does, in a constant process of climbing and balancing himself; sometimes rising a little higher, sometimes falling a little back; one day making good a lodgment in a new great house, another losing a valuable *entrée* by the death, or the ruin, or the caprice of the governor of the fortress—until at length he closes a long life, diligently and successfully employed, without a friend or even an intimate, without having done anything, or written anything, or said anything that can be remembered, but the undoubted possessor of a visiting list great in its quantity and irreproachable in its quality.

At the same time it must be allowed that a successful tuft-hunter cannot be a commonplace man,

'Principibus placuisse viris non ultima laus est.'

As he succeeds by pleasing, he must possess the arts of pleasing. And as he has to exercise them upon persons whom familiarity with the most cultivated society has rendered fastidious, he must possess those arts in an eminent degree. He must have good manners and considerable education; he must talk well and listen well. He must enjoy a good temper, or be able to control a bad one. All these qualities Mr. Thackeray has given to the Major, and he has added to them courage, decision, presence of mind, and sagacity. And yet Major Pendennis does not obtain, and is not intended to obtain, our esteem. The frivolousness of the purposes for which they are employed, makes his talents and even his virtues contemptible. The reader cannot respect a man who does not respect himself, whose self-esteem depends altogether on the verdict of others, who is content to shine with borrowed light and to be splendid in borrowed plumes.

Mr. Thackeray has usually two heroines, a good one and a bad one; one to refuse the hero, the other to marry him. The bad heroine of Pendennis, Miss Blanche Amory, is a picture of

great merit, even taken alone, but still more when compared and contrasted with her predecessor, Becky Sharp. At first sight the features appear to be the same. Both are utterly heartless, both are utterly unscrupulous. The ruling passion of each is vanity, and each pursues her objects without the slightest regard to the rights, or the wishes, or the feelings of any one else. Each is clever and accomplished. They look, in short, at a distance, like twins. And yet, when we come to examine the details of the conduct of each of them, we find them not merely dissimilar but contrasted. Becky is a universal favourite; Blanche is uniformly detested. Becky is frank and simple; Blanche is a lump of affectation. Becky's subjects are faithful to her; Blanche's victims take the first opportunity of escaping from her. The seminal difference—the seed from which all the minor differences spring—is this: Mr. Thackeray has infused a strong dose of common sense into Becky, and a strong dose of folly into Blanche. Each is fond of power. Becky obtains her influence by the slow, sure process of being useful and agreeable. She seduces Miss Crawley, the rich woman of the world, by flattery and wit; old Sir Pitt Crawley, her brother, the bearish, loutish, country squire, by entering into all his schemes, correcting his blunders, and managing his whole household. When she quits him for a short visit to his sister, he follows to implore her immediate return. 'I want you,' he says; 'I can't git on 'without you. I didn't see what it was till you went away. 'The house all goes wrong. It's not the same place. All my 'accounts has got muddled agin. You must come back. Do 'come back! dear Becky, do come!' The female favourite of the father is seldom that of the son; but she subjugates Sir Pitt the Second as effectually as Sir Pitt the First. She reveals to him the secret of his own talents and virtues; proves to him that he has undervalued himself, and is still more undervalued by his wife; and sends him home, after every visit, thinking to himself how much she admires him, and how much he deserves to be admired.

Such are the tactics of Becky. Blanche obtains her power by the coarse and easy instrument of fear. She domineers by teasing and frightening. Her *modus operandi* is well explained in an early dialogue between Sir Francis Clavering (her stepfather) and Captain Strong, his resident companion and man of business.

'"I say, Strong," one day the Baronet said, as the pair were conversing after dinner over the billiard table, and that great unbosomer of secrets, a segar; "I say, Strong, I wish your wife was dead."

'"So do I.—That's a cannon, by Jove.—But she won't; she'll live

for ever — you see if she don't. Why do you wish her off the hooks, Frank, my boy?" asked Captain Strong.

'"Because then you might marry Missy. She ain't bad looking. She'll have ten thousand, and that's a good bit of money for such a poor devil as you," drawled out the other gentleman. "And gad, Strong, I hate her worse and worse every day. I can't stand her, Strong, by gad I can't."

'"I wouldn't take her at twice the figure," Captain Strong said, laughing. "I never saw such a little devil in my life."

'"I should like to poison her," said the sententious Baronet; "by Jove I should."

'"Why, what has she been at now?" asked his friend.

'"Nothing particular," answered Sir Francis; "only her old tricks. That girl has such a knack of making everybody miserable, that hang me it's quite surprising. Last night she sent the governess crying away from the dinner table. Afterwards, as I was passing Frank's room, I heard the poor little beggar howling in the dark, and found his sister had been frightening his soul out of his body, by telling him stories about the ghost that's in the house. At lunch she gave my lady a turn; and though my wife's a fool, she's a good soul—I'm hanged if she ain't."

'"What did Missy do to her?" Strong asked.

'"Why hang me, if she didn't begin talking about the late Amory, my predecessor," the Baronet said with a grin. "She got some picture out of the Keepsake, and said she was sure it was like her dear father. She wanted to know where her father's grave was. Hang her father! Whenever Miss Amory talks about him, Lady Clavering always bursts out crying: and the little devil will talk about him in order to spite her mother. To-day when she began, I got in a confounded rage, said I was her father, and — and that sort of thing; and then, Sir, she took a shy at me."

'"And what did she say about you, Frank?" Mr. Strong, still laughing, inquired of his friend and patron.

'"Gad, she said I wasn't her father; that I wasn't fit to comprehend her; that her father must have been a man of genius, and fine feelings, and that sort of thing: whereas I had married her mother for money."

'"Well, didn't you?" asked Strong.

'"It don't make it any the pleasanter to hear because it's true, don't you know?" Sir Francis Clavering answered. "I ain't a literary man and that; but I ain't such a fool as she makes me out. I don't know how it is, but she always manages to — to put me in the hole, don't you understand? She turns all the house round her in her quiet way. I wish she was dead, Ned."' (Vol. i. pp. 225, 226.)

Becky's weapon is as sharp as Blanche's, perhaps sharper, and she is quite ready to use it when the necessity occurs: but she keeps it in reserve for that necessity; never draws it except in self-defence; and takes care that the wound, though it may smart, shall not rankle. She despises those about her too much

to feel lasting resentment; is always willing to shake hands with a baffled assailant; and generally manages that her adversary shall be as placable as she is herself. Neither Blanche nor Becky cares about truth; but Becky knows the value of falsehood, and that its power is easily worn out by promiscuous use. She reserves it therefore for great occasions, and tells the truth, unless something considerable is to be got by lying. Blanche lies without any motive except the exercise of her ingenuity, and thus wastes her mendacity to no purpose.

Neither Blanche nor Becky cares about her friends, but Blanche adopts and throws them away from mere caprice. She is constantly forming useless intimacies, and turning them into mischievous enmities. Becky bestows her affection only on those whom she thinks worthy of it; that is to say, on those whom she hopes to make her instruments. *If* she finds them useful, and *while* she finds them useful, she 'grapples them to her soul 'with hooks of steel.' When they become useless, she lets them go, but quietly and silently, without any breach, so that if at a future time they should become serviceable, as is the case in one or two memorable instances, she may be able at once to resume them. Blanche and Becky are both fond of admiration, but Becky knows that it is not to be obtained by asking for it. She resolves to be simple and unaffected; and being a consummate actress, she succeeds. Blanche is always imploring attention, always trying on a new manner or a new character. 'She 'drags her shoulders,' says one of her intended victims, 'out of 'her dress; she never lets her eyes alone; she goes about sim-'pering and ogling, like a French waiting-maid.' The inside of Becky is diseased enough, but the outside is polished, consistent, and natural. Blanche's exterior is in as bad taste as her interior is corrupt. It is all fantastic, gaudy, glaring, and ill-assorted.

Becky is a simple character; Blanche is an inconsistent one.

As we use these words in a technical sense, we shall explain them at some length; and we hope that our explanation may throw light on that portion of poetical imitation — by far the most important portion — which has human nature for its subject.

Fictitious characters may, we think, be conveniently divided into three classes — the Simple, the Mixed, and the Inconsistent.

By simple characters, we mean the persons to whom no qualities are attributed by the poet, except those which are subservient to one another, and co-operate in the main work which the person in question has to do. By mixed characters, we mean the persons who are endowed by him with different attributes, independent of one another, some of which are essential to the principal parts which they have to perform, and others have no

connexion with them. By inconsistent characters, we mean those who possess discordant qualities,—qualities which counteract or modify, or even neutralise, one another. The test whether a character is simple, mixed, or inconsistent is, to try what would be the effect of removing any one of its attributes. If that removal would leave it incomplete, unfit to execute the duties assigned to it by the poet, it is a simple character. If the quality supposed to be removed would not be missed, the character is mixed. If that removal would render the rest of the character more harmonious, more efficient for the performance of any one or more of its parts, it is not only mixed, but also inconsistent.

There are no simple characters in real life. Nature varies almost infinitely her attributes, and gives to every man innumerable qualities, some of which are independent of one another, and others are discordant. All her characters are both mixed and inconsistent; and it is this mixture and inconsistency that renders them distinct. Every human being belongs to so many thousand different classes, that no two individuals, possessing precisely the same qualities, in precisely the same proportions, have ever been found. But the poet has not space for these details. The greater part of his characters are simple, because they are wanted only for some particular purpose: they are the Fortis Gyas, fortisque Cloanthus, and Fidus Achates of his muster roll. All that we wish to know of Banquo, Shakspeare tells us; namely, that he is brave. All that we hear of Duncan is that he is kind. We should think it impertinent, if some scenes were added to Macbeth, for the purpose of showing what sort of a husband Banquo was, or what were the favourite amusements of Duncan. Even of the more highly finished characters, the greater part are simple. Ulysses is a simple character. The elements of which he is composed are, strong domestic and patriotic affections, patience, dissimulation, prudence, sagacity, presence of mind, fertility of resource, intrepidity, and daring amounting almost to rashness. Every one of these qualities was necessary to bring him from Ogygia to Ithaca, and to enable him to plan and to effect the destruction of the suitors. They form the whole of his character, so far as Homer has revealed it to us. Richard the Third is a simple character. Even his gaiety could not be abstracted from him without leaving a gap in the general outline. His wit is necessary to show his remorseless unscrupulousness, his unflinching audacity. It is provoked by his crimes. It is most brilliant when he is planning or executing, or reflecting on some atrocity. Hypocrisy, treachery, and murder are his sport. He prepares his crimes with satisfaction,—he looks back to them with mer-

riment. It is not that he has any pleasure in human suffering, but that he is utterly indifferent to it. He does not torture, he only kills, and kills only those who are in his way. But as obstacle after obstacle, that is to say, life after life, that rose between him and the crown, is removed, his delight breaks out in the bitter yet playful humour which makes him at once the most detestable and the most amusing of villains.

Perhaps the finest mixed character ever drawn is Henry, as Prince Hal and as Henry the Fifth. His levity and dissipation, pushed, as they are, almost to dissoluteness, have no connexion with his wisdom and courage. If the ludicrous scenes in the two parts of Henry the Fourth had never been written, we should not have felt their loss. The remainder would have formed a great tragedy, in which Prince Henry would have been a well-drawn, grand, and simple character. If the serious scenes had been lost, we should have had a most amusing comedy, with Falstaff and Hal as its heroes. And yet the character is not one of those to which we have given the name of inconsistent. The baser and the higher qualities of Henry do not interfere with one another. He throws off at once the trifler when he is required to rise into the hero, and the hero when he is at leisure to subside into the trifler. The reader perceives no incongruity. He feels that the same desire for excitement, indifference to consequences, and light-hearted audacity, seduce Hal to indulge his taste for humour at Gadshill and the Boar's Head, and impel Henry to seek glory by encountering Percy at Shrewsbury and all France at Agincourt.

Hotspur, like Henry, is tragi-comic. His wit and his humour almost rival those of Falstaff. They are most brilliant on the gravest occasions. He jests in a stormy interview with the king,—he jests when he is dividing England with his co-conspirators,—he is never more amusing than when he takes leave of his wife before his last fatal battle. And yet we are inclined to class him among simple characters. His gaiety is the mere ebullition of a bold, self-relying, impetuous, ambitious temper, which exults in contest and danger. His delight, as the struggle approaches, foams out in taunt, and jest, and mockery, but his levity does not influence his conduct. Levity is an element in the disposition of Prince Hal, but only in the *manner* of Hotspur.

We now come to inconsistent characters. It may be as well to state expressly, what perhaps is obvious, that by an inconsistent character we do not mean what is generally expressed by those words,—a character to which incompatible attributes are assigned. Such characters cannot exist in nature, and of course

ought to be banished from fiction. We repeat, that by an inconsistent character we mean one of which the elements, though compatible, are repugnant. The great painter of inconsistent characters is Pope. They suit his delight in contrast and antithesis. One of the most finished is that of Wharton.

> 'Thus with each gift of nature and of art,
> And wanting nothing but an honest heart,
> Grown all to all, from no one vice exempt;
> And most contemptible, to shun contempt;
> His Passion still, to covet gen'ral praise,
> His Life, to forfeit it a thousand ways;
> A constant Bounty, which no friend has made;
> An angel Tongue, which no man can persuade;
> A fool, with more of Wit than all mankind,
> Too rash for thought, for action too refin'd:
> A Tyrant to the wife his heart approves;
> A Rebel to the very king he loves;
> He dies, sad outcast of each church and state,
> And, harder still! flagitious, yet not great.'
>
> (*Moral Essays*, Ep. i. p. 193.)

Don Quixote is a boldly-drawn inconsistent character. He is a man of great good sense, and knowledge of books and of the world. If romances of chivalry had never been written he would have passed the whole of his life as he passed the greater part of it,—a respected country gentleman, dividing his time between literature, field sports, and society. But his head is turned by stories of knight-errantry. He devotes himself to their study, admits implicitly all their absurdities, and, while he remains sensible and sagacious on all other subjects, on this alone he is mad. He believes himself to be living in the times of Amadis de Gaul, and Florismarte of Hyrcania, expects adventures like theirs, and makes their conduct his model. So far as these delusions extend, his bodily and his mental senses are perverted. He takes windmills for giants, sheep for armies, pothouses for castles, and Maritornes for a princess. When out of his armour he is just and humane; but when occupied as a knight-errant, he thinks it his duty to require any passenger whom he meets to admit the peerless beauty of Dulcinea, and to murder those who refuse. As a philosopher, he reasons wisely on the theory of government, on the necessity of penal laws, and the duty of submission to authority: as a knight, he attacks the king's officers, breaks the chain of galley-slaves, and lets loose a band of wretches who have just confessed to him the justice of their sentences. With wonderful skill he is made to pass and repass from sanity to madness. He sits before Master Peter's puppet-show, a quiet, intelligent spectator, criticises the management of

the story, and objects to the introduction of bells as an anachronism; but no sooner is he interested in the scene than he believes in its reality, rushes at the little theatre to the rescue of Melisendra, cuts to pieces the hostile puppets, would have beheaded the showman himself if he had not ducked under his stage, and exclaims in the exultation of his triumph, 'Would to 'God that this could have been seen by all the despisers of 'knight-errantry! Where would the brave Gayferos and the 'beautiful Melisendra now have been if I had not been present?' The showman and Sancho convince him that he has taken puppets for men; he agrees to pay for the damage, and sits down with Master Peter and the innkeeper to compute it. King Marsilio, who has lost a head, is valued at four reals; Charlemagne, whose crown is split, at three; and for the fair Melisendra, whose nose is gone, Master Peter asks five. At the name of Melisendra, Don Quixote relapses into his delusion:—'Don't play your tricks 'upon me,' he cries; 'Melisendra must have been safe in Paris 'an hour ago. I watched her horse as she was making her escape: 'he was flying rather than galloping!'

For the perfection of the inconsistent character (as, indeed, for the perfection of every other) we must go to Shakspeare. One of the finest, among the many that he has drawn, is Othello. He is a union not merely of dissimilar qualities, but of dissimilar natures. He is a civilised barbarian. All that we know of his birth is, that it is 'fetched from men of royal siege.' How or when he became a Christian we are not told; but it is certain that he must have passed his childhood in a harem, acquiring with his earliest impressions the jealousy and suspicion respecting women, and the domestic despotism of a Mahometan court. His youth and manhood are military: and we find him, at the opening of the play, 'somewhat declined into the vale of years,' a grave and dignified soldier. He is

> 'The noble Moor, whom the full senate
> Call all-in-all sufficient—the noble nature
> Whom passion cannot shake; whose solid virtue
> The shot of accident or dart of chance
> Can neither graze nor pierce.'

All the barbarian is obliterated. His behaviour during the two first acts justifies Lodovico's praise. Nothing can be more calm or more polished. When, within one hour of his marriage, he is summoned before the senate, he does not resent the contumely or even the violence of Brabantio; he pleads his cause with consummate moderation and skill, accepts the command of Cyprus with modest self-reliance, obeys cheerfully the order of

instant departure, and, without a shadow of suspicion, places Desdemona in Iago's hands to follow him.

The very morning after their arrival at Cyprus, Iago darkly hints to him a doubt as to the firmness of Desdemona's virtue. He accuses her of nothing actually wrong, but states plausible grounds why she should be watched. The suspicion acts on Othello like a specific poison. It sets on fire all the old Mahometan tendency to jealousy, which a European life seemed to have eradicated. His barbarian nature reappears. At first his habits of civilisation combat it.

He proposes to act as becomes a great Venetian noble; to inquire into his wife's conduct; and, if Iago's suspicions prove unfounded, to forget them; if they are confirmed, to separate himself from Desdemona, —

He says,

> 'I'll see, before I doubt; when I doubt, prove.
> If I *do* prove her haggard,
> I'll whistle her off, and let her down the wind:
> Away at once with love or jealousy.'

Desdemona enters, and he exclaims, —

> 'If she be false, O, then heaven mocks itself! —
> I'll not believe it.'

They go together to a great dinner, at the end of which Othello and Iago meet again.

By this time the barbarian has got the upper hand. He demands, indeed, from Iago proof of Desdemona's guilt, but in the meantime assumes it. Iago tells him, by way of proof, that lately he lay with Cassio, and heard him exclaim in his sleep, —

> 'Sweet Desdemona,
> Let us hide our loves.
> Oh, cursed fate, that gave thee to the Moor!'

The falsehood of this story was obvious. Cassio and Iago had parted the very evening of the marriage; they had arrived at Cyprus in separate ships the day before this conversation took place, and the intervening night had been the busy one which was filled by the drunken quarrel and Cassio's disgrace.

Othello swallows it with savage credulity. He no longer thinks of inquiry, or of separation. He is again the Arab or the Bedouin of his youth, and no conduct, except such as might fit a Bedouin or an Arab, occurs to him.

He cries,

> 'Oh blood, Iago, blood!
> Within these three days let me hear thee say,

That Cassio's not alive. — I will withdraw,
To furnish me with some swift means of death
For the fair devil. Now art thou my lieutenant.'

The last words are remarkable. Othello has so thoroughly forgotten the habits of civilised life, that he does not see that, after having murdered his wife, the daughter of a Venetian senator, and assassinated Cassio, a man of high rank in the republic, he cannot remain governor of Cyprus. Well may Desdemona exclaim, —

'My lord is not my lord; nor should I know him,
Were he in favour, as in humour, altered.'

From thence until the very last scene the savage in him reigns triumphant. He does not preserve even the outward proprieties of his station, but insults and strikes his wife in the presence of the envoy from the senate.

But the instant that he has satiated his revenge, the spirit from the desert seems to be appeased by the sacrifice, and quits him. He now 'knows that his act shows horrible and 'grim.' He listens to the proofs of Desdemona's innocence, apologises frankly to Cassio, and sits in judgment on his own folly and crime. The horror of his situation, instead of disturbing, quiets him. He resumes the calm dignity of a great Venetian leader. Lodovico proposes to carry him away a close prisoner for trial. Othello makes no direct answer to the threat, but draws in a few clear and singularly unimpassioned lines, a short outline 'of these unlucky deeds,' and then retires from the 'extreme perplexity' in which he is involved by the only exit that is left to him, a resolute and not undignified suicide.

Mr. Thackeray's Blanche is, as we said before, an inconsistent character. Her desire of power is constantly interfering with her desire of sympathy. She cannot help teasing those whom she wishes to please. In her pursuit of immediate admiration she loses permanent esteem, and becomes a plaything when she aims at being an idol. When she sits between two admirers, she flirts alternately with each, and thus betrays to them both the emptiness of her kindness. Becky, we repeat, is a simple character. Numerous as her qualities are, they are not discordant. Not one of them could be taken from her without damaging her powers of worldly advancement.

Rawdon Crawley is one of Mr. Thackeray's best inconsistent characters. He is a gambler, indeed a blackleg, and would be an actual swindler if a swindler could be tolerated in society. He approaches as near to swindling as the law will allow. He preys on the young and the inexperienced, contracts debts

which he knows never can be paid, and lies whenever it suits his convenience. Yet this degraded nature has its amiable and its respectable side. He is fond of his wife and of his child. He is brave, and he is grateful. He has an honour of his own, which, though its province is narrow, reigns there supreme. He knows that his only chance of escaping ruin is through the friendship of Lord Steyne. But the instant that he suspects how that friendship has been purchased, he breaks with his patron, sends back, poor as he is, the thousand pounds which he believes to have been Steyne's present to Becky, and is with difficulty restrained from shooting him.

Arthur Pendennis is a mixed character. He is a poet grafted on a dandy. So far as he is a dandy, he is vain, conceited, and extravagant. So far as he is a poet, he is inflammable and inconstant, easily attracted and easily repelled. Having scarcely any seriously adopted opinions, or principles, or plans, he is at the mercy of those around him. It is a defect in the story that his conduct recurs in a sort of circle. He falls in love with an actress, and is jilted; makes love to Blanche, is well received by her, and then cast off, and to please his mother offers himself to Laura; she refuses him, and so ends the first volume.

In the second volume he falls in love with a porter's daughter, and is cured by a fever; to please his uncle he proposes himself again to Blanche, and is engaged to her. She jilts him again, and again he offers himself to Laura; and, as it was necessary to end the novel, this time she accepts him.

There is nothing very attractive in such an outline, but many of the details are full of beauty. The wonder with which, after he is cured of an attachment, he revisits its former object, is admirably described. So is his last courtship of Blanche at Tunbridge Wells, where the *blasé* dandy and *blasée* flirt, after mutual attempts, all ineffectual, to be fond and sentimental, confess to one another that the marriage is not of their own seeking, but has been arranged for them by their mammas and uncles, and that they must submit to it like a good little boy and girl.

We have said nothing about the tragical parts of the story — about Colonel Altamont and his frightful secret and mysterious threats; or Warrington's discarded wife. They are tacked so slightly to the comic portions, that they might easily be detached altogether. And if Mr. Thackeray should think fit hereafter to lighten Pendennis, and so improve its chances of floating down to posterity, we recommend that these be the portions of its rigging that are first cut away.

Esmond is a reproduction of the manners, feelings, thoughts, and even style which prevailed from 180 to 140 years ago. It is a wonderful *tour de force.* Without doubt, one of the charms of art is the triumph over difficulty. But the triumph must not be a barren one. The value of what is gained must bear a considerable proportion to the labour that has been expended. The epic in twenty-four books, from each of which a letter was eliminated, was not more but less pleasing than if the author had allowed himself free use of the alphabet. Taken at the best, the task of a novelist is difficult. It is no easy thing to invent a plausible story, a story which shall have a beginning, a middle, and an end, — a beginning which shall raise expectation, a middle which shall continue it, and an end which shall satisfy it. Neither Richardson nor Fielding has succeeded in doing so more than once. It is less difficult, but still far from easy, to people that story with characters, distinct, natural, and amusing; and to make them talk and act like the living models supplied by the author's experience. If to the obstacles which nature has thrown across his path, the poet thinks fit to add fresh ones of his own; if he builds up walls in order to jump over them, the reader always suspects that what is supplied to him is not the author's best; that some real merit which he would have enjoyed is sacrificed to an imaginary one which he does not care about.

Now the amount of the self-imposed budren which Mr. Thackeray has undertaken to bear may be estimated, when we consider how few have been the writers who have ventured to submit to it. For at least 3000 years poets have taken their principal characters from history or mythology. But they have seldom borrowed more than the names, and perhaps one or two of the most notorious qualities, and one or two of the most notorious adventures, of their heroes. Everything else they have generally copied from what they saw around them. All Homer's men and women, whether they be Europeans or Asiatics, Greeks or Phæacians, Trojans or allies, speak the same language, use the same weapons, amuse themselves with the same games, worship the same gods, believe in the same legends, are in fact identical in habits and manners. All those of Virgil, whether natives of Ilium, or Carthage, or Sicily, or Latium, are Romans of the Augustan age. Four great tragic poets, perhaps the four greatest that ever wrote, have brought on the stage Theseus. In the Œdipus Coloneus, he is an Athenian statesman; in the Supplices, an Athenian rhetorician; in Phédre, a courtier of Louis Quatorze; and in the Midsummer

Night's Dream, a highly educated English gentleman. Not one of these great writers thought himself bound to reproduce the Theseus of tradition, half-savage, half-divine, the first cousin and imitator of Hercules, who roamed over Greece destroying robbers, killing wild beasts, and carrying off women; a mixture of giant and knight-errant; raised, according to one legend, for his virtues, to be a god; according to another, for his crimes seated for ever in hell. Even Walter Scott, though, in order to please critics who are intolerant of anachronisms, he endeavours to copy the manners and feelings of a past age, does not try to speak in its language or in its style. His events may be mediæval, but he relates them like any other novelist of the nineteenth century. Though the scene of Rob Roy is laid 140 years ago, and though Osbaldiston is his own biographer, he tells his story as if he had just finished his education in the new town of Edinburgh. The courage, the diligence, and the skill of Mr. Thackeray have enabled him to avoid this inconsistency. Colonel Esmond writes as one of the best of her wits might have written in the reign of Queen Anne.

We cannot, however, avoid thinking that this merit has been purchased too dearly. The reader feels always that he is listening to falsetto tones; that he is looking at the imitation of an imitation. If Esmond had been confined within as short limits, it might have taken rank with the 'Defence of Natural 'Society.' But a parody three volumes long becomes tiresome. We want the author to throw aside the fetters which impede his movements, though we require him to keep the costume which disguises his person. We wish to hear Jacob's own voice, though the hands be the hands of Esau.

The period at which Mr. Thackeray has laid his scene was scarcely a matter of choice, when once he had determined to imitate antiquated forms of thought and expression. Those who succeeded the wits of Queen Anne's days were moderns. Thomson, Goldsmith, Adam Smith, and Hume, all remembered Pope and Swift; but they wrote as we do; — better, perhaps, so far as they took more pains, but with no other perceptible difference. The giants, indeed, who ruled the literary world between the Reformation and the Restoration used a style and a language sufficiently different from our own; but they were unfit for domestic narrative. No one could have tolerated the loves of Beatrix and Esmond enveloped in the grand periods of Bacon or Milton, or even in the quaint, loose verbiage of the Arcadia. The school which Mr. Thackeray has imitated was remote enough to be peculiar, and near enough for its peculiarities not to offend.

But that period had little else to recommend it. It was one to which every Englishman must look back with disgust. Up to the Restoration the English, at least in the higher classes, had been a serious people. Primogeniture as respects land, and the exclusion of the younger branches of even the greatest houses from nobility, — the happy accident from which so many of our peculiarities flow, — had prevented the existence among us of the idle, frivolous caste which, during the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries, formed the aristocracy of the greater part of the Continent; a caste excluded by its prejudices from commerce, from the bar, from medicine, and, except in its high dignities, from the church, and naturally led, with the exception of the small portion of it that could find employment in arms, to dedicate its ample leisure to place-hunting and amusement. From the Conquest until the Restoration the rich and the noble of England had had duties to perform. The rich were great merchants or feudal proprietors; the noble were statesmen or soldiers; all the members of the younger branches, and the younger members of the eldest branch, who in France would have thronged the court of the sovereign, or lived in the *ruelles* of the capital, were actively engaged in business or in professions.

But during the sixty or seventy years which immediately followed the Restoration, London seems to have been the headquarters of a fashionable crowd which, in numbers, in wealth, in idleness, in dissoluteness, in every thing, in short, except education and refinement, rivalled the *grand monde* of Paris. Of course we cannot now dwell on the causes of this phenomenon. The increased wealth of the unemployed class was probably connected with the abolition of the feudal tenures, and the facilities thereby given to mortgages and sales, the increased occupation of land by tenants instead of by proprietors, the enormous augmentation of trade, and the large incomes, indeed, the large fortunes, that could be made in the public service, or squeezed from the royal bounty. Its dissoluteness was partly a reaction against the austerities of Puritanism, and partly a coarse imitation of the polished dissipation of France; but it would probably have shown itself, even if there had been no Puritans, and no French: in fact, it was the necessary result of wealth wanting occupation and literature. There were, of course, literary circles as brilliant as those of any other period, the circles in which the great writers of that age were formed; but every thing shows that the mass of the fashionable world was then deplorably ignorant. The women knew nothing, and professed to know nothing. The men passed many of their mornings, and almost all their evenings, in clubs, and at the

theatres; smoking, drinking, and playing at cards, or listening to stilted tragedies or indecent comedies.

This levity was made hideous by the intermixture of ferocity not more savage, indeed, perhaps less so, than that of the previous century, but horrible in itself, and still more horrible as the cruelty of careless voluptuaries. A sanguinary penal code was enforced with unrelenting severity. Temple Bar and London Bridge were fringed with human heads. With not one-fourth of the present population, there were probably fifty times as many executions every year as there are now. The whippings of females, as well as of males, were perpetual, and were paraded up and down the most public thoroughfares; and yet these punishments were as inefficacious as they were cruel. The roads around London were beset by highwaymen; the streets were infested by footpads; amateurs in crime, who have been immortalised in 'The Spectator' under the name of Mohocks, insulted and injured passengers by way of amusement. No one seems to have engaged in politics who was not sooner or later, and generally more than once, guilty of treason; the basest and the most unscrupulous traitors being those whom their crowns placed above the law. Duels were frequent and ferocious; the seconds fought as well as the principals, and victory was often obtained by treachery. Other aristocracies may have been more contemptible, but none can have been less attractive or amiable, than that of the English court from the return of Charles the Second down to the death of Queen Anne.

Over-indulgence, except indeed to the whimpering little goddess whom he deifies in every novel, is not Mr. Thackeray's weakness. His *dramatis personæ* are as black as their originals could have been. The only prominent male character who is not an habitual drunkard is the hero. Three Lord Castlewoods are introduced. The first is described as passing his early life abroad, where he was remarkable only for duelling, vice, and play,—and where he marries and then deserts the mother of the hero. He passes his middle age in London, a hanger-on of ordinaries, and a brawler about Alsatia and Whitefriars; marries during his first wife's life an old maid with money; and is killed at the battle of the Boyne. The second is a drunken sensualist, who ill-treats and insults his wife, spoils his children, gambles away his property, and is killed in a duel. The third turns Roman Catholic, marries ill, quarrels with his own relations, and is left, at the end of the story, the slave of his wife's family of German adventurers.

The hero, of course, possesses the ordinary heroic qualities of courage, generosity, and affectionateness. But even *he* con-

spires for the purpose of occasioning a new revolution, though he strongly suspects that his success will be mischievous to his country. He is not seduced by the entreaties of any friend; he is not driven on by the blind, instinctive, spaniel-like loyalty, which leads a legitimist to throw his fortunes, his life, his family, and even his patriotism at the feet of him whom he adores as his sovereign. He is himself the originator of the scheme; he estimates calmly the results; 'has his own fore-'bodings as to what they may be, his usual sceptic doubts as to 'the benefit which may accrue to the country by bringing a 'tipsy young monarch back to it.' The motive which, in spite of all these doubts and forebodings, impels him to endeavour to inflict, at the hazard of a civil war, such a master on his country, is merely the hope that by doing so he may please his cousin Beatrix Esmond, one of the heroines of the novel, a violent Tory, who for ten long years has been the object of Esmond's unsuccessful adoration. With no other object, he brings the Pretender in disguise to England, and conceals him in the house of his relation Lady Castlewood, the mother of Beatrix. His suspicions as to the worthlessness of his intended master increase during the journey, and are turned into convictions by the Prince's behaviour as a guest. Still he perseveres, until the Prince's attentions to Beatrix become marked. Then,

'Horrible doubts and torments racked Esmond's soul. 'Twas a scheme of personal ambition, a daring stroke for a selfish end — he knew it. What cared he in his heart who was king? Were not his very sympathies and secret convictions on the other side — on the side of People, Parliament, Freedom? — And here was he engaged for a prince that had scarce heard the word liberty; that priests and women, tyrants by nature both, made a tool of.' (Vol. iii. p. 234.)

Beatrix is sent into the country; and Esmond, having provided against this danger, resumes the conspirator, and passes a long day with the Prince, 'writing proclamations and ad-'dresses to the country, to the Scots, to the clergy, to the 'people of London and England, announcing the arrival of the 'exiled descendant of three sovereigns, and his acknowledgment 'by his sister as heir to the throne.' The Prince discovers the banishment of Beatrix, and resents it. 'If I have garters to 'give away,' he cries, 'tis to noblemen who are not so ready 'to think evil. Bring me a coach, and let me quit this place, 'or let the fair Beatrix return to it.'

Esmond's loyalty is instantly suspended. He takes the Prince to a window looking into Kensington Square, where the watchman is crying the hour; reminds his guest, the man whom he is endeavouring to make his sovereign, that 5000*l.*

is offered by Parliament for his capture, points out to him how easily he could betray him; and adds, 'By the Heaven 'that made me I would do so, if I thought the Prince, for *his* 'honour's sake, would not desist from insulting *ours*.'

The Prince promises amendment, and Esmond continues as zealously as before to urge on the revolution. The Prince renews his attempts on Beatrix. Esmond breaks his sword, and renounces him. Detestable as most of the characters in the novel are, we do not recollect one to whom equal selfishness and wickedness are attributed. Even in France, demoralised as it has been by sixty years of revolutions, the most unprincipled *émeutier* would not make one merely to gratify his mistress.

We have already mentioned Mr. Thackeray's practice of having a good and a bad heroine; the one to refuse the hero, the other to marry him. In Esmond they are mother and daughter, the daughter being the bad heroine who rejects, the mother the good heroine who accepts. We do not object to the mere disparity of age. Many a boy of eighteen has fallen in love with a woman of twenty-eight. But in this case a man of forty falls in love with a woman of about fifty,—a woman with whom he has lived in intimacy ever since he was a child, who was the confidant and approver for many years of his love for her own daughter, whom he has always considered, and wished to consider, as his mother. Such a plot is neither natural nor pleasing.

Both the heroines are well drawn. The whole work is full of praises of the mother, Lady Castlewood. Perhaps these are meant only to show the uxoriousness of Esmond; but if they express Mr. Thackeray's opinion as to the beauty of the portrait which he has painted, we feel bound to record our dissent. Lady Castlewood appears to us to be a woman with a strong sense of duty and religion, and a heart always overflowing with affection, and eager to receive it. But all is spoilt by violence of temper, and by a jealousy so irritable and so exclusive, that even Esmond, after their marriage, cannot venture in her presence to show his love for their daughter. 'Her husband's 'love,' says the daughter, Mrs. Warrington, 'was a gift so 'precious, that she was for keeping it all, and could part with 'none of it, even to her daughter.' Mr. Warrington affirms that their happiness in marriage was perfect. If that was true, Colonel Esmond's standard of happiness must have been low, since it was conferred on him by a wife of strong feelings, irritable, suspicious temper, quick sensibility, and undiscriminating, unrelenting jealousy.

One or two scenes from the first volume will illustrate her

character. Her beauty has been somewhat impaired by small-pox, and her husband has neglected her for a Mrs. Marwood.

'"'Twas after Jason left her, no doubt," Lady Castlewood said, with one of her smiles to young Esmond (who was reading to her a version of certain lines out of Euripides), "that Medea became a learned woman, and a great enchantress."

'"And she could conjure the stars out of heaven," the young tutor added, "but she could not bring Jason back again."

'"What do you mean?" asked my lady, very angry.

'"Indeed I mean nothing," said the other, "save what I have read in books. What should I know about such matters? I have seen no woman save you and little Beatrix, and the parson's wife, and my late mistress, and your ladyship's woman here."

'"The men who wrote your books," says my lady, "your Horaces, and Ovids, and Virgils, as far as I know of them, all thought ill of us, as all the heroes they wrote about used us basely. We were bred to be slaves always; and even of our own times, as you are still the only lawgivers, I think our sermons seem to say that the best woman is she who bears her master's chains most gracefully. 'Tis a pity there are no nunneries permitted by our church. Beatrix and I would fly to one, and end our days in peace there away from you."

'"And is there no slavery in a convent?" says Esmond.

'"At least if women are slaves there no one sees them," answered the lady. "They don't work in street gangs with the public to jeer at them; and if they suffer, they suffer in private. Here comes my lord home from hunting. Take away the books, my lord does not love to see them. Lessons are over for to-day, Mr. Tutor." And with a curtsey and a smile she would end this sort of colloquy.' (Vol. i. pp. 204, 205, 206.)

Lord Castlewood next confides to Esmond *his* annoyances.

'"Is a woman," he says, "never to forgive a husband who goes a tripping? Do you take me for a saint?"

'"Indeed, Sir, I do not," says Harry, with a smile.

'"Since that time my wife is as cold as the statue at Charing Cross. I tell thee she has no forgiveness in her, Henry. Her coldness blights my whole life, and sends me to the punch-bowl or driving about the country. My children are not mine, but hers, when we are together. 'Tis only when she is out of sight with her abominable cold glances, that they'll come to me, and that I dare to give them as much as a kiss; and that's why I take 'em and love 'em in other people's houses, Harry. I'm killed by the very virtue of that proud woman. Virtue! Give me the virtue that can forgive; give me the virtue that thinks not of preserving itself, but of making other folks happy."' (Vol. i. pp. 270, 271.)

Esmond fancies that this is a case for mediation, and ventured most gently to hint to his adored mistress, that she was doing her husband harm by her ill opinion of him; and that the happiness of all the family depended upon setting her right.

'"Have you ever heard me utter a word in my lord's disparagement?" she asked hastily, hissing out her words, and stamping her foot.

'"Indeed, no," Esmond said, looking down.

'"Are you come to me as his ambassador—*You?*" she continued.

'"I would sooner see peace between you than anything else in the world," Harry answered; "and would go on any embassy that had that end."

'"So *you* are my lord's go-between?" she went on, not regarding this speech. "You are sent to bid me back into slavery again, and inform me that my lord's favour is graciously restored to his handmaid? He is weary of Covent Garden, is he, that he comes home and would have the fatted calf killed?"

'"There's good authority for it, surely," said Esmond.

'"For a son, yes: but my lord is not my son. It was he who broke our happiness down, and he bids me to repair it. I presume you have fulfilled your mission now, Sir. Perhaps you too have learned to love drink, and to hiccup over your wine or punch;—which is your worship's favourite liquor? Perhaps you too put up at the Rose on your way through London, and have your acquaintances in Covent Garden. My services to you, Sir, to principal and ambassador, to master and—lacquey."' (Vol. i. pp. 273—275.)

Beatrix is inconsistent in the sense in which we use that word. She has great excellences and great defects, and her different qualities interfere with one another. She has courage, decision, presence of mind, and, for some purposes, self-command. She has intelligence, eloquence, wit, and knowledge of men and of things. This powerful machinery is directed by ambition and vanity, and driven by a strong will. But her pride is overbearing, her affections are capricious, her temper is irritable and wayward, and she inherits her mother's jealousy. She has a quick moral sense, a clear perception of the distinctions between virtue and vice, and a general wish to do right, and yet she is perpetually doing wrong—not from ignorance or carelessness, or callous familiarity with evil—she is conscious of her faults while she is committing them, conscious of her defects while she is yielding to them, she repents when all is over,—but she obeys the passion of the moment. Here are two views of her by herself. The first is drawn just after she is engaged to the Duke of Hamilton:—

'"I hope the world will make you happy, Beatrix," says Esmond, with a sigh. "You'll be Beatrix till you are my Lady Duchess—will you not? I shall then make your Grace my very lowest bow."

'"None of these sighs and this satire, cousin," she says; "I take his Grace's great bounty thankfully—yes, thankfully; and will wear his honours becomingly. I do not say that he hath touched my heart; but he has my gratitude, obedience, admiration. I have told him that,

and no more; and with that his noble heart is content. I am twenty-five years old." "Twenty-six, my dear," says Esmond. "Twenty-five, sir. I choose to be twenty-five; and in eight years, no man hath ever touched my heart. Yes, you did once for a little, Harry, when you came back, after Lille, and engaging with that murderer, Mohun, and saving Frank's life—I thought I could like you; and mamma begged me hard, on her knees, and I did—for a day. But the old chill came over me, Harry, and the old fear of you and your melancholy; and I was glad when you went away, and engaged with my Lord Ashburnham, that I might hear no more of you, that's the truth. You are too good for me somehow. I could not make you happy, and should break my heart in trying and not being able to love you. But if you had asked me when we gave you the sword, you might have had me, Sir, and we both should have been miserable by this time.' (Vol. iii. pp. 112, 113.)

The second occurs soon after that engagement has terminated by the Duke's violent death. She is taking leave of Esmond as he sets out on his perilous expedition to bring the Pretender to London:—

'"Stay, Harry," continued she, with a tone that had more despondency in it than she was accustomed to show. "Hear a last word; I do love you. I do admire you—who would not, that has known such love as yours has been for us all? But I think I have no heart. At least I have never seen the man that could touch it; and had I found him, I would have followed him in rags, had he been a private soldier, or to sea, like one of those buccaneers you used to read to us about when we were children. I would do anything for such a man, bear anything for him; but I never found one. You were ever too much of a slave to win my heart; even my Lord Duke could not command it. I had not been happy had I married him. I knew that three months after our engagement—and was too vain to break it. O Harry! I cried once or twice, not for him, but with tears of rage because I could not be sorry for him. I was frightened to find I was glad of his death; and were I joined to you, I should have the same sense of servitude, the same longing to escape. We should both be unhappy, and you the most, who are as jealous as the Duke was himself. I tried to love him; I tried, indeed I did: affected gladness when he came; submitted to hear when he was by me; and tried the wife's part I thought I was to play for the rest of my days.

'But half an hour of that complaisance wearied me, and what would a lifetime be? My thoughts were away when he was speaking; and I was thinking, O that this man would drop my hand, and rise up from before my feet. I knew his great and noble qualities, greater and nobler than mine a thousand times, as yours are, cousin,—I tell you a million and a million times better. But 'twas not for these I took him,—I took him to have a great place in the world, and I lost it,—I lost it, and do not deplore him,—and I often thought as I listened to his fond vows and ardent words, O, if I yield to this man

and meet *the other*, I shall hate him and leave him. I am not good, Harry: my mother is gentle and good, like an angel; I wonder how she should have had such a child. She is weak, but she would die rather than do a wrong; I am stronger than she, but I would do it out of defiance. I do not care for what the parsons tell me with their droning sermons; I used to see them at court, as mean and as worthless as the meanest woman there. O I am sick and weary of the world. I wait but for one thing, and when 'tis done I will take Frank's religion and your poor mother's, and go into a nunnery and end like her."'

Here is a grand scene, in which Lady Castlewood, her son, and Esmond force her into the country to escape the solicitations of the Prince. Lady Castlewood proposes to accompany her:—

'"For shame!" burst out Beatrix, in a passion of tears and mortification. "You disgrace me by your cruel precautions; my own mother is the first to suspect me, and would take me away as my gaoler. I will not go with you, mother; I will go as no one's prisoner. If I wanted to deceive, do you think I could find no means of evading you? My family suspects me. As those mistrust me that ought to love me most, let me leave them; I will go, but I will go alone: to Castlewood, be it. I have been unhappy there and lonely enough; let me go back; but spare me at least the humiliation of setting a watch over my misery, which is a trial I can't bear. Let me go when you will, but alone, or not at all. You three can stay and triumph over my unhappiness, and I will bear it as I have borne it before. Let my gaoler-in-chief go order the coach that is to take me away. I thank you, Henry Esmond, for your share in the conspiracy. All my life long, I'll thank you, and remember you; and you, brother, and you, mother, how shall I show my gratitude to you for your careful defence of my honour?"

'She swept out of the room with the air of an empress, flinging glances of defiance at us all, and leaving us conquerors of the field, but scared, and almost ashamed of our victory. It did indeed seem hard and cruel that we three should have conspired the banishment and humiliation of that fair creature. We looked at each other in silence; 'twas not the first stroke by many of our actions in that unlucky time, which being done, we wished undone. We agreed it was best she should go alone, speaking stealthily to one another, and under our breaths, like persons engaged in an act they felt ashamed in doing.' (Vol. iii. pp. 260, 261.)

We are always ordered to admire the beauty of a heroine; but if we obey, it is usually an act of faith. The description is so vague, that we are forced to take her charms on trust. But Mr. Thackeray's portrait of Beatrix is so animated and so individualised, that it affects the imagination as if it were painted in colours instead of words:—

'She was a brown beauty; that is, her eyes, hair, and eyebrows and eyelashes, were dark: her hair curling with rich undulations,

and waving over her shoulders; but her complexion was as dazzling white as snow in sunshine; except her cheeks, which were a bright red, and her lips, which were of a still deeper crimson. Her mouth and chin, they said, were too large and full, and so they might be for a goddess in marble, but not for a woman whose eyes were fire, whose look was love, whose voice was the sweetest love song, whose shape was perfect symmetry, health, decision, activity; whose foot as it planted itself on the ground was firm but flexible, and whose motion, whether rapid or slow, was always perfect grace, —agile as a nymph, lofty as a queen,—now melting, now imperious, now sarcastic, there was no single movement of hers but was beautiful. As he thinks of her, he who writes feels young again, and remembers a paragon." (Vol. ii. pp. 115, 116.)

Beatrix is the only character in Esmond that interests; but there are many that amuse. All of them, indeed, amuse; for, except when he is playing with a doll which he wants to dress up as a good heroine, Mr. Thackeray can produce nothing that is not amusing.

One of the best is Father Holt. Mr. Thackeray has wisely abandoned the demure face and stealthy walk and soft hypocrisy of the conventional Jesuit. His Jesuit is a bold, gay man of the world, frank in his exterior, intrepid in danger, kind and affectionate to those whom it is not his interest to injure, unscrupulous when an instrument is to be obtained or an obstacle is to be removed, and keeping in a separate compartment of his mind, undisturbed by the politics with which the rest is filled, his classical tastes and his theological speculations. Such, we have no doubt, the men of action in the order, the men whose intrigues aimed at establishing or subverting thrones, always must have been and always will be.

James the Third has sat to two great painters. Walter Scott took him in middle age, and painted him with a grave and melancholy expression; serious, dignified, and imposing. Mr. Thackeray gives him to us in his youth, before he had been saddened by disappointment and improved by experience. His levity, his sensualism, his obstinacy, his ingratitude, his habitual sacrifice of the future to the present, of business to pleasure, and of every person and of every purpose to his own immediate gratification, are features boldly conceived and vigorously executed: and Mr. Thackeray has skilfully thrown over the whole a varnish of courtesy and graciousness, which softens and renders almost pleasing the despicable and odious character that lies beneath it. Sir Walter was as much of a Jacobite as it was possible to be in the nineteenth century. Mr. Thackeray's politics are not obtruded. What peeps out of them appears to us to be Whig. James the Third has fared in their hands accordingly.

We cannot quit Esmond without remarking the excellence of the still-life vignettes with which it is adorned. Castlewood House is described over and over, and always with fresh beauty. With great skill it is generally made to form the background of some memorable incident, and imprinted with that incident on the conception of the relator. It is thus introduced, with wonderful effect, just after the parting of Mohun and Castlewood, in apparent amity, but with a fatal quarrel in the heart of each.

'Lord Castlewood stood at the door watching his guest and his people as they went out under the arch of the outer gate. When he was there, Lord Mohun turned once more; my Lord Viscount slowly raised his beaver, and bowed. His face wore a peculiar livid look, Harry thought. He cursed and kicked away his dogs, which came jumping about him — then he walked up to the fountain in the centre of the court, and leaned against a pillar and looked into the basin. As Esmond crossed over to his own room, late the chaplain's, on the other side of the court, and turned to enter in at the low door, he saw Lady Castlewood looking through the curtains of the great window of the drawing room over head at my lord as he stood regarding the fountain. There was in the court a peculiar silence : and the scene remained long in Esmond's memory : — the sky bright over head : the buttresses of the building and the sun-dial casting shadow over the gilt *memento mori* inscribed underneath: the two dogs, a black greyhound and a spaniel nearly white, the one with his face up to the sun, and the other snuffing amongst the grass and stones, and my lord leaning over the fountain, which was plashing audibly. 'Tis strange how that scene and the sound of that fountain remain fixed on the memory of a man who has beheld a hundred sights of splendour, and danger too, of which he has kept no account.' (Vol. i. pp. 313, 314, 315.)

We will extract another, of equal vividness. Esmond is revisiting Castlewood.

'He had not seen its ancient grey towers and well-remembered woods for nearly fourteen years, and since he rode thence with my lord, to whom his mistress with her young children by her side waved an adieu. There was the fountain in the court babbling its familiar music, the old hall and its furniture, the carved chair my late lord used, the very flagon he drank from. Esmond's mistress knew he would like to sleep in the little room he used to occupy; 'twas made ready for him, and wall-flowers and sweet herbs set in the adjoining chamber, the chaplain's room.

'Esmond rose up before the dawn, passed into the next room, where the air was heavy with the odour of the wall-flowers, and tried the spring, and whether the window worked still. The spring had not been touched for years, but yielded at length, and the whole fabric of the window sank down. Esmond closed the casement up again, as the dawn was rising over Castlewood village; he could

hear the clinking at the blacksmith's forge yonder among the trees, across the green, and past the river, on which a mist still lay sleeping.' (Vol. iii. pp. 171—174.)

When an author has been long and repeatedly before the public, the verdict of that great tribunal is likely to be a fair one. We believe its judgment on Mr. Thackeray—a judgment which we are not inclined to question—to be this:

That he is a bad constructor of a story; that his openings are tedious and involved, his conclusions abrupt and unsatisfactory; and that the intervening space is filled by incidents with little mutual dependence, and sometimes, as in Pendennis, repetitions of one another. On the other hand, it is admitted that these incidents, taken separately, are often admirable, well imagined, and well told, and amusing exhibitions of the weaknesses or the vices of those who take part in them.

We say 'weaknesses or vices,' because this is the second reproach addressed to Mr. Thackeray. It is said that his men, if they are not absurd, are tyrants or rogues: that his women, if they are not fools, are intriguers or flirts. This accusation, if it be an accusation, is true as respects his men; and nearly true as respects his women.

If the *dramatis personæ* of Vanity Fair were average samples of the two millions who form the nation that inhabits London, or even if they were samples of what an American would call the Upper Ten Thousand of the Londoners, the London world would be a detestable one. It would be as black morally as it is physically.

Now we are ready to admit that the darkness of Mr. Thackeray's patterns is an artistic defect: that is to say, we think that their texture and general effect would be improved by the introduction of a few threads, not as milkwhite and as superfine as Sir Charles Grandison or Clarissa, but of good average quality and colour; such as Belford, or Colonel Morden, or Miss Howe, or Lady G. But if the objection be not to the artistic effect but to the truth of Mr. Thackeray's characters, if he be accused of giving not merely an unpleasant but a false view of human nature, the answer is this: that in Esmond the scene is laid in what we have already described as the period in which the English character was most demoralised; and that in Vanity Fair the characters are taken almost exclusively from two classes—the pursuers of nothing but wealth, and the pursuers of nothing but pleasure. Mr. Thackeray paints the former as vain, greedy, purseproud, oppressive, and overbearing in prosperity, and grovelling and base in adversity, and envious and suspicious at all times. He describes the latter as frivolous,

heartless, and false, with as much selfishness and vanity and malignity as their Russell-Square neighbours, though concealed under a smoother exterior. And who can say that these pictures are false?

The persons who form the *élite* of London society, the men whose objects are great and whose pursuits are ennobling, the politicians and men of science, the lawyers and physicians, the men of literature and taste, the poets and artists—all these are as much ignored as if the writer were not aware of their existence. The only allusion to such a class is old Osborne's complaint that his daughter, Mrs. Frederic Bullock, 'invites him 'to meet damned littery men, and keeps the earls and honour-'ables to herself.' Vanity Fair is not a fair sample of the London world taken as a whole, but is a not very exaggerated picture of two portions of it.

We have less to say in defence of Pendennis, for there the field is wider, and yet the result is nearly the same. Even in Pendennis, however, though the hero and his friend Warrington are literary men, their literature is of an humble kind. It is not the literature of statesmen, historians, or philosophers, of those who write for the purpose of influencing, or instructing, or improving mankind; it is not the literature of those whose object, though more selfish, is still magnanimous and splendid, of those who aim at widely diffused and permanent fame;—it is the literature of those who write for bread, who use their pens as a labourer does his spade, or a weaver his shuttle. Unless there be some reason for believing that hack writers in general are better than those whom Mr. Thackeray has described, we have no right to quarrel with his descriptions. There are too in Pendennis one or two persons whom we neither laugh at nor hate. There is Laura, who is intelligent and amiable, though indeed she behaves shamefully to the poor girl from the porter's lodge. There is a Mr. Pynsent, in whom there is no harm. There is a Lady Rockminster, who is sensible and kind, though rather *brusque*. In fact, however, we must admit that Pendennis is open to the reproach that it professes to be a fair specimen of English morality, and is not so.

Lastly, Mr. Thackeray is accused of lavishing on his heroines undeserved praise. It is said, that having with great skill put together a creature of which the principal elements are undiscriminating affection, ill-requited devotion, ignorant partiality, a weak will and a narrow intellect, he calls on us to worship his poor idol as the type of female excellence. This is true. Mr. Thackeray does all this; it is one of the greatest blemishes in his books. Happily it is a blemish that can be removed with

ease. Nothing more than a pair of scissors is necessary. Let him carefully cut out every puff which he has wasted on Amelia, and Helen, and Laura, and Rachel; let him leave them, as all the characters in a novel ought to be left, to the reader's unbiassed judgment, and they would take their proper rank among his *dramatis personæ*, though it may differ from that to which their inventor thinks them entitled.

So much for Mr. Thackeray's faults. As to his merits, it is admitted that he is unrivalled by any living writer as an inventor and a describer of character; that he has penetrated into the lowest cells of pride, vanity, and selfishness, and laid open some of the secrets of the human prison-house which never were revealed before. Every reader admires the ease and vigour of his dialogue, its sparkling wit and its humour, sometimes broad, sometimes delicate, but always effective.

The few extracts which we have made from the serious portions of his works are sufficient to show that he has great tragic powers. Nothing can be more exquisitely imagined or described than the parting of George Osborne and Amelia. His natural tendency, however, is towards comedy, or rather towards satire. He

'Shines in exposing knaves and painting fools.'

But his favourite amusement is the unmasking hypocrisy. He delights to show the selfishness of kindness, the pride of humility, the consciousness of simplicity. If any of Mr. Thackeray's characters had been copied from real life, and the originals could recognise themselves in his imitations, they never would tremble more than when some apparently good act was ascribed to them. They would expect to see in the next page the virtue turn into a vice or a weakness.

Mr. Thackeray, in his English Humourists, resembles little Mr. Thackeray as a satirist. He is as indulgent to his real as he is severe towards his imaginary characters. He treats, indeed, Congreve with superciliousness, and Sterne with contempt almost amounting to disgust, and trembles before the awful phantom of Swift, but embraces all the other spirits that he calls up — Addison, Steele, Prior, Gay, Pope, Hogarth, Smollett, Fielding, and Goldsmith — with the cordiality of a brother in the craft.

When we read the names which Mr. Thackeray has strung together in his list of humourists, we felt some doubt as to his principle of classification, as to the common quality which grouped together writers so different as Pope and Sterne. In

his first lecture Mr. Thackeray professes to point out this common quality: —

'The humorous writer,' he says, 'besides appealing to your sense of ridicule, professes to awaken and direct your love, your pity, your kindness—your scorn for untruth, pretension, imposture—your tenderness for the weak, the poor, the oppressed, the unhappy. To the best of his means and ability he comments on all the ordinary actions and passions of life almost. He takes upon himself to be the week-day preacher, so to speak.'

Now, it is difficult to say what moral writer does not come within so capacious a definition as this. At the head of the humourists of the eighteenth century we should have to put Johnson, Horace Walpole, and Cowper; for never were men who commented more diligently on all the ordinary actions and passions of life, and their comments were deeply tinged with the wisdom resembling absurdity, and the absurdity resembling wisdom, to which we give the name of Humour.

We will not, however, carp any more at Mr. Thackeray's nomenclature. He has given us a set of amusing lectures on interesting persons, and we need not inquire further into his reasons for selecting them. Little new was to be said about Swift after Johnson and Scott, or about Addison after Johnson and Macaulay; but we were glad to see a whole lecture given to Steele, to whose biography less attention has been paid than his amusing chequered character and the great share which he occupies in our earlier English literature deserve.

There occurs, however, in this lecture a passage which leads us to suspect that Mr. Thackeray had not studied, with the attention that his great office requires, all the works of the authors whom he is criticising. He treats the dinner, in the Polite Conversation, as a specimen of the habits of the times. 'Fancy,' he says, 'the moral condition of that society in which 'a lady of fashion provided a great shoulder of veal, a sirloin, a 'goose, hare, rabbit, chickens, partridges, black puddings, and 'a ham for a dinner for eight Christians. What—what could 'have been the condition of that polite world in which people 'openly ate goose after almond pudding, and took their soup in 'the middle of dinner?' (p. 155.) Now, the great Simon Wagstaff, in the preface to his immortal work, has answered all this by anticipation.

'Some,' he says, 'will perhaps object that when I bring my 'company to dinner I mention too great a variety of dishes, not 'consistent with the art of cookery, or proper for the season of 'the year; and *part of the first course is mingled with the 'second;* besides a failure in politeness by introducing a black

'pudding to a lord's table, and at a great entertainment. But 'if I had omitted the black pudding, what would have become 'of that exquisite reason given by Miss Notable for not eating 'it? The world perhaps might have lost it for ever, and I 'should have been justly answerable. I cannot but hope that 'such hypercritical readers will please to consider that my 'business was to make so full and complete a body of refined 'sayings as compact as I could: only taking care to produce 'them in the most natural and probable manner, in order to 'allure my readers into the very substance and marrow of this 'most admirable and necessary art.'

It is remarkable that, in his notice of Pope, Mr. Thackeray omits the works in which Pope was strictly a humourist, and notices only those in which he was strictly a poet. Now, we sympathise with his admiration of the satire on Addison, and of the conclusion of the Dunciad, though we should hesitate before we admitted that in the latter 'Pope shows himself the equal of 'all poets of all times.' But if we had had to point out the work in which the peculiar powers of Pope, and especially his powers as a humourist, shine the brightest, we should have selected not the Satires, or the Dunciad, but the Rape of the Lock.

The best of the lectures is, we think, that on Fielding; and we are delighted to read Mr. Thackeray's bold and cordial and discriminating praise of this great, but, we fear, somewhat neglected artist; a moralist, from whom the generation that is now passing away imbibed a heartier contempt for meanness and duplicity, and a heartier sympathy with courage, frankness, and manliness, than we fear are to be acquired from the more decorous narratives which form the mental food of their successors.

---

ART. VII.—1. *Report from the Select Committee on the Office of Speaker; together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, &c.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 12th May, 1853.

2. *Returns of the Sittings of the House of Commons*, 1852–53: *of the Divisions of the House; Public Bills; Private Bills; Public Committees; and Election Petitions.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 16th August, 1853.

3. *A practical Treatise on the Law, Privileges, Proceedings, and Usage of Parliament.* By THOMAS ERSKINE MAY, Esq. Second Edition. London: 1851.

4. *The Rules of Proceeding and Debate in Deliberative Assemblies.* By LUTHER S. CUSHING. Boston: 1853.

WHILE Cabinet Councils, the Press, and the Public are discussing improvements in our representative system, we will venture to solicit attention to another question of public policy — of less political importance, it is true, yet scarcely less concerned in the good government of this country, — we mean the machinery of legislation. The first political object to be desired in a free country, is the best practicable constitution of the legislature; the second, is its successful operation, as shown by good laws, wise councils, fruitful inquiries, and practical efficiency. It is not sufficient to provide for the election of the fittest representatives of the people: but, having been brought together, they must be set to work so as to become efficient instruments of legislation. Organisation is not less essential in a senate than in a factory; and in both alike, however skilful may be the 'hands,' their several parts must be nicely adjusted, in order to realise the full results of their combined exertions.

Under a well-ordered system much may be done, even with bad materials. If, according to Horne Tooke's cynical suggestion, a rope were drawn round the market-place for representatives of the people, political drilling would not be without its benefits. The roughest recruits become in time good soldiers; and Hullah's pupils, though no musicians, elicited the highest praise of the great Duke, who had never seen 'such discipline in 'his life.' What, then, may not be expected from the organised and well-directed energies of the chosen men of our Senate — enlightened, capable, and ambitious?

And truly there is enough for them to do! Never were so many important functions combined in a deliberative assembly, as in the British Parliament. Our legislation has become the most difficult and complicated of human labours; and the utmost facilities which experience can suggest, will merely afford a slight alleviation of its pressure. Happy were our German ancestors in their simple assemblies! A few of their leaders made short speeches, to which their audience responded in a manner very significant, but, according to our notions, somewhat disorderly. 'Si displicuit sententia, fremitu adspernantur: 'sin placuit, frameas concutiunt.' Weary debates, from night till morning, under the glare of Bude lights, are amongst the discoveries as well as penalties of modern civilisation.

So many circumstances have contributed to enlarge the powers and increase the activity of Parliament, that of late years it has been continually working at 'high pressure.' A vast arrear of

legislation had long been accumulating upon us. After a century of inaction, and three and twenty years of war, the statesmen of our own time have had to do the work of many generations — to unmake as well as to make laws — to detect and expose abuses — to break down monopolies — to bear up against corrupt interests — to resist prejudices which had long been sanctioned by our laws — and to adopt higher principles and a wiser policy. But much as they have had to accomplish — and however speedily and well it has sometimes been done — the necessities of our age and country have still been in advance of their utmost endeavours. A new life has grown up in the British Empire and people. In population, wealth, enterprise, and commerce, in science and the arts, in political enlightenment, in moral and social advancement, our progress has been without a parallel in the history of the world. And while the requirements of an advancing society have demanded the aids of sound legislation, our popular institutions and a free press have caused an extraordinary strain upon the Legislature. And well and wisely, on the whole, has Parliament met the increasing demands upon its energies. The history of England since the Peace, not written by Alison, or any pseudo-philosopher of his school, is creditable to the sagacity of our statesmen, and the enlightened wisdom of the Legislature. Generally keeping pace with the spirit of the times — sometimes being even in advance of it, as in the repeal of the Catholic disabilities — they have, at the same time, resisted changes, however strongly urged, which were not consistent with the general policy of our institutions.

Satisfactory as we must pronounce the general results of our legislation to have been*; yet, when we observe, from day to day, the process by which they are practically wrought out, we cannot help wondering that they should ever have been accomplished. The political difficulties of legislation in a popular assembly are sufficiently great; but when to these are added a defective organisation, an insufficient division of labour, and indefinite facilities for obstructive debate, they can only be overcome by such struggles and sacrifices as ought not to be exacted of those who devote themselves to the public service. The process of legislation has not kept pace with its increasing requirements. 'We have outgrown our forms,' said Sir John Pakington, in the last Session; and we trust that Parliament will subscribe to his opinion.

The antiquity of our Parliamentary forms, and the almost

* For a summary of the Recent Progress of Legislation see the Edinburgh Review, No. cxciii. Art. 3.

unvarying steadiness with which they have been observed, for at least three centuries, is a remarkable feature of our Constitution. Precedents for most of the proceedings of both Houses may be found in the very first volumes of their journals, recorded in a language, now quaint and obsolete; but outliving, by the mere force of usage, our written laws, and passing unscathed through civil wars and revolutions. There is a dignity as well as merit in this force of ancient custom, which secures a more willing and reverential obedience, than any modern rules or bye-laws. In the House of Commons the cry of 'order' has a prescriptive authority, while in other assemblies it is more often the signal for confusion. But this reverence for custom is not without its evils. Politicians of every shade had long agreed in regarding the British Constitution with pride, until the veneration of many had degenerated into fanaticism. It was 'holy ground,' and all around and about it was holy. And everything seemed to be near it, and to concern it. To disfranchise a corrupt borough, to reform a corporation, to repeal the duty on corn, or to leave off hanging men for sheep-stealing, were all 'inroads upon our glorious Constitution,' until the phrase could scarcely be repeated without a smile. And thus has it been with our Parliamentary customs, which are a part of the Constitution. We have been proud of them, — and with good cause. We have seen them adopted — often to the very letter — in every deliberative assembly in the world; in France, Belgium, the United States of America, and all the British Colonies. Their adoption elsewhere is partly due to their own proved excellence, and partly to the *prestige* attaching, in every free country, to British institutions. But here again, the true faith has not been unmixed with idolatry; and to discontinue an old form was to cast down an idol. With the exception of the daily distribution of the printed Votes and Proceedings, for which we are mainly indebted to the zeal of the late Mr. Rickman, we cannot recall a single change, of any importance, in Parliamentary practice, before the Reform Act. In matters of form the Commons had almost exposed themselves to Napoleon's sarcasm upon the Bourbons; — 'Ils n'ont rien appris, — ils 'n'ont rien oublié.'

An example of this continued reluctance to change may be found in the Report on the office of Speaker, which we have placed at the head of this Article. In 1606, the House, having suffered inconvenience from the absence of their Speaker, appointed a committee to search for precedents; 'thereby the 'better to direct themselves what were meet to be done here-'after, upon all occasions of the Speaker's absence, by sickness

'or otherwise.' The Speaker, however, recovered; and the Committee of 1853 express their regret 'that the Committee (of '1606,) which had been appointed to consider the very same 'matters which, after a lapse of nearly 250 years, have now 'been referred to your Committee, made no report to the House.' That is to say, for 250 years nothing had been done to prevent the recurrence of an evil, which during that time had frequently been experienced. And, true to the instinct of the House of Commons, the Committee now approach the subject with 'great caution' and 'apprehension'; offering, as one of their reasons for recommending the least possible change, 'the 'reluctance apparently entertained by the House, in former 'times,' to do anything that was necessary in the matter. And so it has been on other occasions.

Some statesmen have been foremost in opposing changes in the procedure of Parliament, while others have regarded them with indifference; caring little to understand them, and undervaluing their political importance. Of all our public men who have concerned themselves with this department of Parliamentary Reform, the present Speaker stands preeminent. Fitted by his talents and qualified by his previous training and acquirements, Mr. Shaw Lefevre was marked out for the high office to which he was elected. An active county member, an experienced and able magistrate, — he soon became known as an unrivalled chairman of Parliamentary Committees. Here he displayed the conspicuous talents, judgment, tact, and urbanity, for which he has since been distinguished on a wider and more honourable field. His eminent services in the chair are universally acknowledged. The Commons are justly proud of the Speaker of their choice, and respect his authority with a willing obedience; but few of them are aware of his unceasing exertions, behind the scenes, to facilitate their proceedings, and smooth the numerous difficulties by which they are beset. With a genius for active business, he was not long in discovering where the Commons 'had outgrown their forms.' Having mastered the dry technicalities of Parliamentary procedure, so as never to be at fault, he watched their practical operation with a critical eye; and with singular judgment, prudence, and sagacity has striven to introduce every practicable improvement. More useful changes have been made during the fourteen years of his Speakership, than in the time, we will make bold to say, of any three of his predecessors.

And here we would observe that, in such matters, the Speaker's position is one of considerable delicacy. In expounding and giving effect to existing rules, his authority is paramount; but

new rules can only be made by the House, in which, strange as it may appear, though Speaker, he has himself no voice. It is only by his personal influence with other members, and by the weight attached to his opinions, whether expressed in private, or stated in evidence before Committees, that he is able to promote any change which he may think desirable. Hence he is constrained to a cautious reserve in committing himself to opinions, which he pronounces without authority, and the adoption of which he is unable further to advocate. Moreover, upon questions of this description the Government is ordinarily passive; and the House, being left without any moving power, is languid and indifferent. Nor is it usual to press forward any proposition of the kind, except with the general concurrence of experienced members, on both sides of the House. Sometimes, also, it is advisable to ascertain the feeling of the House of Lords before any change is proposed, and even to induce them to originate it. Thus while proposals, to which he stands committed, are exposed to numerous chances of failure, the Speaker is often deprived of the credit of having himself suggested acceptable improvements. But none of these discouragements have deterred Mr. Speaker Lefevre from promoting all reasonable amendments in the proceedings of Parliament, with unwearied perseverance, until, sooner or later, he has succeeded in carrying them into effect. To some of these successful experiments we shall have occasion to allude, in reference to other beneficial changes, by which we hope the remaining years of his Speakership will be signalised.

In order to estimate the importance of an efficient organisation of the labours of Parliament, it will be necessary to pass them under review, to point out their extent and variety, and to explain the arduous duties and engagements of its members. As the main burden of public business falls upon the House of Commons, our attention will be more particularly directed to its proceedings. Of its labours and endurance the last Session will supply numerous illustrations.

The Parliament was assembled on the 4th Nov. 1852, and was prorogued on the 20th August, 1853. The leaves of autumn had not fallen when it met; the leaves of another summer had begun to fall, before it had concluded its laborious sittings. The Session extended over a period of 290 days; during which the House of Commons sat, for despatch of business, 160 days, and was occupied 1193 hours, 14 minutes; of which, 133½ hours were after midnight. The average of each day's sitting was rather less than 7½ hours; but a glance at Mr.

Brotherton's detailed return * will fall upon a column, showing that upon numerous occasions, during the last two months of the Session, the House continued sitting for upwards of 15 hours out of the 24! For example, on the 5th July, the House met at 12 o'clock, and adjourned on the following morning at ¼ before 4, having divided no less than five times after midnight, upon Mr. Keating's ill-timed motion on Dockyard Promotions. And on several other days the House met at 12, and, with a suspension of business for two hours only in the afternoon, adjourned between 3 and 4 o'clock on the following morning.

The bare statement of these unseasonable hours suggests feelings of weariness and exhaustion. What Court could administer justice, with temper, for fourteen hours? Where are the men of business who could usefully confer upon their own affairs, for so many hours? Even the poor literary drudge, writing for his daily bread, would fail under labours so long sustained. Yet members of Parliament are found to endure them, month after month, and the public rarely hear of their sufferings. Occasionally, however, a voice breaks forth beyond their walls, and reveals the secrets of the prison-house. Let it tell its own tale.

On the 28th July,

'The Clerk was proceeding at half-past one o'clock to read the remaining orders of the day, twenty-eight in number, when—

'Mr. Brotherton, amid cheering from all sides of the House, rose and moved that the House do now adjourn. He protested against going into the consideration of new bills at that time of night. He had abstained of late from interfering to move the adjournment of the House, because he considered that he might as well attempt to stop the tide. He had for twenty years perseveringly endeavoured to bring the House to observe reasonable hours. The attempt was now beyond his strength: but he really hoped that next Session some measure would be adopted to prevent a repetition of such late sittings. The House had now been sitting thirteen hours and a half. This might be done now and then; but when, as had frequently happened of late, the House sat fourteen, fifteen, and sixteen hours, the labour was beyond what human nature could endure.' (From the *Times*, 29th July, 1853.)

The Members cheered, the clerk read the next order of the day, and the House, not profiting by the counsels of their faithful monitor, continued sitting till a quarter past three in the morning!

---

* Sittings of the House, 1852-53, No. 945. of sess. 1853.

Again, on the 5th of August, in Committee of Supply, at nearly one in the morning —

'Mr. Wilkinson appealed to the Government not to press them so hard. The House ought really to *strike for shorter hours of labour.*'

'Mr. Hume said he must insist on the motion for reporting progress. He was obliged to leave the House last night at one o'clock. He could stand it no longer!'

Nor was the last Session exceptional and unprecedented. The Session of 1847–48 exceeded it in length by three days, and still more in the number and duration of its sittings; the House having sat on 170 days and for 1407 hours, or ten days and 214 hours more than in the last Session. And even in other Sessions, less remarkable for their duration, it will be found that the sittings of the House have been not much less protracted. For example, in 1834 the House sat on 140 days and for 1187 hours; in 1842, on 125 days and for 1008 hours; in 1845, on 119 days and for 1026 hours; and in 1850, on 129 days and for 1104 hours. In these four, and some intermediate Sessions, the average duration of the daily sittings exceeded that of the last Session, amounting to between eight and nine hours. Long and heavy Sessions have become the rule, and Sessions of even moderate length, the rare exception. The Committee on the office of Speaker calculate the sittings of the House during the present Speakership, as upwards of 13,000 hours, of which 1196 have been after midnight; and conclude, from an examination of the Journals, that already more business has been transacted in his time than during the entire period of any previous Speaker. Assuredly the Speaker will be able to give a good account of his stewardship.

If the late Session had been even longer than it was, its protracted sittings would have been justified by the extraordinary number and importance of its measures; but, generally, the length of the Session is no criterion of the business transacted. On the contrary, in the House of Commons, as elsewhere, idleness being 'the root of all evil,' sets loose every tongue, and encourages unprofitable, if not mischievous discussion. The more there is to do, the less will time be wasted: and no expedient can be suggested, so efficacious in restraining the abuses of Parliamentary debate, as a large budget of measures submitted, at an early period, by the Government, and distributed equally over the entire Session. And while a feeble and inert Government provokes opposition, a strong and active Government quells it in Parliament, and discourages it in the country. A strong Government, therefore, is equally desirable for facili-

tating practical legislation, as for other political objects; and the fruitful Session of 1853 was due to an Administration combining every political and personal element of strength, and using its power for the best and most practical purposes.

But with all political facilities for good legislation, can it be necessary that Parliament should be occupied so large a proportion of every year, straining to do its appointed work, and yet leaving much undone? Is it fitting that the legislature of an old country, with long-established institutions, and defined principles of law, should be as much engaged, year after year, in deliberating upon new laws, as if it were the Constituent Assembly of a Model Republic, having institutions and laws to create out of political chaos? Here there is little to construct, though much to repair, improve, and finish. And to do this work, Parliament has at its command the most advanced political science, enlightened public opinion, and all the practical ability and experience of the nation. With these aids to legislation, a strong Government, apart from political obstacles, ought to experience little difficulty in the enactment of good laws. No facility should be conceded, if inconsistent with the fullest publicity and ample means of discussion; but expedients may be devised for simplifying the process of legislation, and, at the same time, improving its character.

On account of the great length of some of the Parliamentary Debates, it is very commonly supposed that discussion, followed by small results, forms the main business of the House of Commons; whereas, by far the larger part of its business is transacted with little or no discussion. In the last Session, there were 11,378 entries in the votes, of orders made, bills read, committees appointed, and other proceedings of the House; and probably not more than a twentieth part of them were debated. Many of them could scarcely have been sufficiently considered, while hundreds of questions, proposed for consideration, failed to obtain a hearing. The 'Votes and 'Proceedings' of a single day have sometimes amounted to a volume. On the morning of the 20th of April last, the Votes and Supplementary Papers delivered to Members extended to no less than 84 folio pages—being equal to an octavo volume of 168 pages; and again, on the 23rd July, they contained 80 folio pages, or 160 octavo pages.

On turning to the list of business appointed for each day, the hopelessness of attempting to dispose of it, is immediately apparent. To select a few of the most remarkable days: on the 21st July, there were 33 orders of the day, and 79 notices of motions; on the 22nd, 23 orders of the day, and 72 notices of

motions; and on the 29th, 25 orders of the day, and 73 notices of motions. It should, perhaps, be explained to the uninitiated, that orders of the day have already been appointed for consideration, by the House itself; and that notices are given by individual Members, with a vain hope of being able to submit to the House propositions of their own.

On some days, in addition to an extraordinary list of business for the House itself, there were no less than 30, 32, and even 33 committees sitting for four or five hours in the morning; and in which upwards of 200 Members were engaged.

The pressure of committee business upon the Members of the House was unusually severe during the last Session. There were no less than 49 Election Committees, consisting of five Members, which sat, upon an average, for $5\frac{1}{2}$ days each. Of these, the Chatham, the Cork, and the Clitheroe cases each occupied 14 days, and the Liverpool case 21. There were 51 Public Committees, consisting generally of about 15 Members, but, in many instances, of a much greater number. As many as 31 Members served on the Irish Tenant Right Committee, and 38 on the Committee on Indian Territories. The latter sat 46 days, the Railways' Committee 40 days, and the Committee on Public Petitions 87 days. There were also 44 committees on opposed Private Bills, many of which were occupied for several weeks, as well as 119 committees on unopposed Private Bills. The aggregate number of these committees amounted to 263.

The assembling of these numerous committees, and of the crowds repairing to them, is a stirring sight. It should be viewed in Barry's noble octagon Hall, which may be termed the political centre of the British Empire. Midway between the two Houses, and common to them both, it is the central chamber whence all the communications of the vast Palace of Westminster diverge. Straight through it, the Queen on her throne, in the House of Peers, may see the Speaker, in his chair in the House of Commons; and, as if to illustrate the quick pulsations of our political system, here is the Electric Telegraph, reporting events as they occur within these busy precincts, and speeding them far and near with its magic wires.

Here, then, let us take our stand, and watch the moving groups as they pass on. They form a panorama of English society, in which representatives of every class are exhibited. Among the Members are many whose names are 'familiar as 'household words:' but they are soon lost in the pressing throng. There are counsel, attornies, and civil engineers — mayors, aldermen, town-councillors, and town-clerks—directors,

secretaries, and shareholders — clerks and short-hand writers, — election agents, publicans, and incorruptible voters — pilots and harbour-masters—general officers and Parsee merchants—dignitaries of the Church and dissenting ministers — farmers and cotton-spinners. But when will they all have passed under review? Their numbers and variety proclaim the imperial attributes of Parliament, which has gathered them together.

Various as these groups, are the jurisdiction and inquiries of the committees whose sittings they are about to attend. The rooms in which they assemble are approached by a corridor upwards of 600 feet long; and every room, throughout its length, has its Court of Inquiry and its audience, or eager expectants outside its doors. In one, the government of our Indian Empire is investigated; in another, the clauses of a Turnpike Bill discussed. The largest principles of public policy, and the most petty details of local administration — subjects for the deliberations of a Cabinet Council, and of a parish vestry, are here alike considered. At the same time, judicial inquiries are proceeding, by which public and private interests, and often the character of the parties concerned, are more largely affected than by the decisions of all the Judges in Westminster Hall.

Day after day the members of committees are occupied with these absorbing duties, in addition to their laborious attendance upon the sittings of the House itself. A few minutes before four o'clock they are released from the committee rooms by the welcome announcement that 'Mr. Speaker is at prayers,' and hasten to the meeting of the House.

And now begins the proper business of the day, which is as remarkable for its variety and miscellaneous character as for its extent and duration. Petitions are presented, reports brought up, private bills advanced a stage, and sometimes discussed, returns ordered, notices given, and lastly before the commencement of the debates of the evening, questions are addressed to Ministers of the Crown.

This political catechism has become one of our popular institutions. Without the formality of a debate, every matter supposed to be of public interest is brought under notice, and the opinions of the Government promptly elicited. While it is of the highest value in awakening the attention of the House and public opinion, it increases the responsibility and strengthens the hands of the Executive. But questions put merely to satisfy curiosity or attract personal notice are so frequent, that the advantages of the interrogatory privilege are apt to be overlooked. It would seem to be the chief amusement of some members diligently to read

the newspapers in the morning, and to ask Ministers of State in the afternoon, if they have read them too, and what they think about them. And in order to be prepared to answer such questions (often fitter for the club window than the Senate) the Minister must devote himself to newspaper literature as well as to state-papers. The happy facility with which Lord Palmerston would turn the laugh against his questioners has often formed an agreeable prelude to the graver and more wearisome business of the evening.

When all questions are exhausted, the House proceeds to the regular business appointed for the day, often of a character as miscellaneous as the questions. No classification of subjects is attempted. When Government measures are entitled to precedence, they are, indeed, arranged with a view to facilitate the general progress of business; but at other times, the arrangement is literally left to chance, the precedence of motions being determined by ballot. Nor is Government business always free from the intrusion of other debateable topics; for whenever the Committee of Supply is appointed to sit, it challenges the proposal of a medley of chance motions. The 2nd of August last affords a good illustration of this practice. The business appointed for that day was the Committee of Supply; but in the votes appeared twelve different notices of motions, or amendments to be proposed before going into committee. They related to 'the Dublin 'Hospitals,' 'the Kafir war,' 'arterial drainage in Ireland,' 'the 'Royal Geographical Society,' 'the Norwich election petition,' 'the annexation of Pegu,' 'the Metropolitan Police,' 'the diocese 'of Bath and Wells,' 'the Postal arrangements at Stoke-upon-'Trent,' 'the Parsee merchants Jevangee Merjee, and Pestongee 'Merjee,' 'the state of the Metropolitan Bridges,' and 'the 'conduct of the East India Company towards the Carnatic 'stipendiaries.'

The multitude of minor subjects, introduced independently of the general business of legislation, cannot fail to have been noticed. The columns of advertisements, in the daily papers, are scarcely more diversified than the columns of Parliamentary debates. A cabman at Bow Street, a pauper at Lewisham, a maniac at Colney Hatch — each in their turn — within a week occupied the attention of the 'Grand Inquest of the Nation.' Like the elephant's trunk, which, having uprooted a forest-tree, can pick up a pin, this potent and flexible instrument of popular government, having provided for the government of India, demands fair play between Mr. Serjeant Adams and the termagant who had called the policeman at Clerkenwell 'a 'pig.'

Many evils result from this confusion of subjects and this absence of classification. The Government measures are retarded, not so much by the discussion to which they naturally give rise, as by the continual intrusion of other subjects of debate. This delay is often a serious inconvenience, more particularly in regard to financial and fiscal questions which require a speedy determination; and as the cause is in constant operation, it at length affects so many measures, that the general business of the Session is unduly postponed. The Government bills are contending with one another for advancement, and some are kept waiting for months, without making any progress. And while the Government are thus embarrassed, the members who have contributed to the delay, are themselves exposed to continual disappointment. Week after week the motions they have been anxious to bring forward are postponed, until speeches composed for the occasion are forgotten, or dressed up again for some other debate. The more pertinacious endeavour to obtain an irregular hearing on motions for adjournment, or on going into Committee of Supply, and thus increase the general delay; while those who value the convenience of the House more than their own voices, throw up the game with as good a grace as may be. For any Member, unconnected with the Government, to succeed in passing a measure of his own, has long been regarded as nearly hopeless.

These difficulties are aggravated by the unequal pressure of business upon the House of Commons. Often when that House is sitting night and day, to the distress of Mr. Brotherton, it has been observed by an irreverent wit, that the Lords sit scarcely long enough to boil an egg. This inequality arises, in some measure, from the privileges of the Commons, by which all bills are required to originate with them, which impose a burden upon the people; and it is much to be desired, that some arrangement could be made, by which a larger proportion of bills might originate in the House of Lords. With this object, a partial relaxation of their privileges was agreed to by the Commons in 1849; and the propriety of making some further concessions is worthy of their consideration. At the same time, it must be confessed that the ill-advised attempt of the Opposition Peers to amend the Succession Duty Bill—in open violation of the undoubted privileges of the Commons — does not encourage such concessions.

But political causes contribute more to this unequal pressure upon the two Houses than the stumbling-block of privilege. On the 14th of April, 1848, Lord Stanley, after adverting to the inconveniences arising from the inaction of the House of Lords

in the early part of the Session, and the undue pressure upon it at the conclusion, encouraged a relaxation of the privileges of the Commons with a view to the introduction of a greater number of Bills into the House of Lords; but at the same time he added: —

'He had remarked that, as a general rule, Bills originating in their Lordships' House were not always received with great favour by the other branch. He had observed, that whether from the non-publication of their Lordships' Papers, or the scanty attendance of their Lordships not attracting public attention, undoubtedly it often happened that measures which passed that House with apparent unanimity, and without exciting any objection out of doors, were made the subject of severe contest and strong animadversion when they reached the other House. He would, therefore, as a general rule, infinitely prefer that Bills should come in the first instance from the House of Commons, believing that the more proper function of their Lordships was to control, amend, and revise the legislation of the House of Commons.'

Sir Robert Peel, we believe, entertained the same opinion; and it can scarcely be doubted, that whether the Commons should ever think it prudent to relax their privileges or not, the great burden of legislation will inevitably continue to press upon the most powerful and popular branch of the Parliament. The representative body is in close communication with the people, and gives expression to public opinion; its proceedings are observed with universal interest; and, being the dominant power in the State, its views of public policy are ordinarily decisive. The Upper House, on the other hand, though abounding in men of the highest talents and individual popularity, is constitutionally independent of public opinion; it has no recognised modes of communication with constituencies and the people; and its political weight being inferior to that of the Commons, its voice is less potential in regard to the ultimate success of measures discussed in Parliament. For these reasons, the Commons must generally be the originating and motive, and the Lords the controlling, power in the State; and the pressure upon the former is a political necessity, to be reckoned among the difficulties of every succeeding Session.

As the end of the Session approaches, the result of accumulated delays becomes conspicuous. It seems as if all the work of the Session were still to be done. Every one has been harassed and overtasked; but when will the Session be over? On Monday, the 8th of August last, when Parliament had been sitting for nine months, there were still forty-seven Public Bills before the Commons, in different stages, to be considered before

the Session could be brought to a close. And so it has been in former years, until the evil has become chronic, and, under the present system, incurable. The bills which have thus accumulated are either hurried through, at last, without proper consideration, and sent up, in the last fortnight, to the Lords, who had been sitting for months with folded arms; or, after having occupied much time, and given occasion to numerous debates, are ultimately abandoned. Both these inconveniences have been constant subjects of complaint, particularly in the House of Lords.

The Government of India Bill, in the last Session, having been nineteen days under discussion in the House of Commons, between the 4th of June and the 29th of July, at length reached the House of Lords, where the second reading was appointed for the 6th of August. On that occasion, Lord Malmesbury complained that there were '42 bills before their 'Lordships, and 31 coming up from the House of Commons — 'making 73 bills to be considered during a fortnight;' and as regards the India Bill itself, he said that it had reached the Lords at a time 'when it was physically impossible for any 'other party, except that of the Government, to collect a suffi- 'cient number of Peers to discuss the question as it ought to be 'discussed.'

To these observations Lord Aberdeen replied: —

'Now, my Lords, as to the period of the Session at which this Bill comes before you, I must confess that long as I have been a member of this House — and I have been a member longer than any of your Lordships now present — *this is a complaint that I have never ceased to hear at the close of every Session.* I admit that, on many occasions, that complaint has been made with great truth and justice.'

Nor is Lord Aberdeen the only Premier who has made such admissions. In 1848, Lord Stanley pointed out, very forcibly, the extent of the inconvenience, and proposed, as a remedy, to enable the Lords to suspend a bill from one Session to another, and, in the meantime, to refer it to a competent legal adviser. A Bill to effect this object was brought in by his Lordship, to which the Lords agreed, though not without the suggestion of several objections. In the Commons, however, not being very favourably received, it was allowed to drop. Propositions of this kind, indeed, are to be viewed in their political bearings, rather than as matters of Parliamentary form. Lord Campbell had pointed out that, 'the proposed change might be sometimes 'employed as a strong argument in the hands of an Opposition, 'for the postponement of a measure which it might be of the

'utmost importance to pass speedily; and it was obvious that 'there might be great change of circumstances in the interval 'between one Session and another.' Pretexts for delay are generally plausible, and, to timid minds, much more acceptable than direct objections to the merits of a measure itself. And thus, if the forms of the House permitted it, a subtle opponent might be able to unite a majority in agreeing to the postponement of a measure, where he would fail in an attempt to secure its rejection.

So long as the business of a Session is accomplished at last — no matter with what inconvenience and confusion — it may be said that the public interests do not suffer. The work is done, and we need not concern ourselves with the manner of doing it. Nothing can be further from the truth. Every Session witnesses many important measures necessarily abandoned by the Government for want of time. This sacrifice, which has been facetiously described as 'The Massacre of the Innocents,' had become so frequent under Lord Melbourne's Administration, that Lord Lyndhurst was able to vex the Government and delight the Opposition with a long list of the victims, whose untimely fate he wittily described at the end of every Session. A still greater number of measures are withheld, lest they should impede the progress of those which have been already introduced. It is true that they are, for the most part, merely postponed until another year; yet, admitting the philosophy of the maxim, that no good law is ever propounded which does not, sooner or later, take effect, such postponements are inconvenient and often hazardous. It is surely desirable to legislate for our own times rather than for posterity; but a generation is sometimes allowed to pass away before a measure, of which the principle has been favourably regarded, is successfully carried into effect. The Charitable Trusts Bill, originally proposed by Lord Brougham in 1816, has at length become law in 1853; and Lord John Russell, in adverting to this circumstance, observed, with as much truth as humour, that this was 'about 'the ordinary period for bringing any considerable measure to 'maturity.' The justice of his remark is also exemplified by the history of the Bills for establishing County Courts and the Registration of Assurances.

The long delay of such measures is, doubtless, to be ascribed to other causes—as, for example, to an unformed or inactive public opinion, and the opposition of powerful interests—as well as to obstacles of a more formal character. Each succeeding Session, however, has its own pressure of political questions, by which measures of inferior public interest are set aside, until

changes of Government — changes in the constitution of the House itself, — and new subjects to occupy the minds of the people, may endanger the success of good laws, which, with better opportunities, might sooner have been brought to maturity.

Nor is the enumeration of evils arising from the chance-medley of Parliamentary business yet exhausted. The pressure of the work is so great and so long continued, that towards the conclusion of the Session, when the greater part of the business still remains to be done, an irritable impatience is apt to take possession of the calmest minds, and steady judgment gives way to haste and indifference. Hence many of the grave defects which are found in our Statutes, to the injury of the public, and the discredit of the Legislature. How can it be otherwise? The Bills must be passed, somehow or other: the Session advances, but they make no progress, till at length the time arrives when, in the words of Sir Francis Baring, 'any man who occupies the time of the House is a public enemy;' and then they are hustled through, with amendments hastily made, or impatiently rejected. To pass a Bill at all is now the object; and the form in which it passes is of little moment. And this, after sitting several months for eight hours a day, with numerous Committees aiding the House in its labours, and all the ablest practical minds in the country brought together for the public good! If Parliament were assembled for no more than a month, this journey-work, with such materials, would scarcely be excused. How much longer, then, is it to be borne, with a Parliament having more than sufficient time, not shrinking from its task, and working with abundant means at its command? The defective organisation, of which we complain, amounts to a grave political evil, the practical correction of which would be a worthy achievement for the first statesmen of our age.

The postponement of measures, to the very end of the Session, is attended with this further evil, that it becomes no longer possible to obtain the true sentiments of Parliament. The London season is over, and the centrifugal force of pleasure and fashion has become irresistible. The continent, the watering-places, and the moors, have thinned the senatorial ranks, and left the field in possession of the Government and a small body of volunteers. The House, it is true, now becomes more manageable; the few skirmishers being rarely a match for the regular forces of the Government. Yet no reliance is to be placed upon the result of a division in a thin House; and it may be well to notice that the only two defeats sustained by the Go-

vernment, in passing their India Bill, occurred on its last stages, at the end of July.

All the inconveniences we have enumerated, as well as some others which we will not pause to notice, have long been acknowledged by those who are conversant with the practical working of the Parliamentary system. But it may be asked — are they not inseparable from the very nature of our free Parliament, and the plain result of its freedom of speech and unlimited jurisdiction? That the practical administration of affairs, in so popular an assembly, will always be exposed to many difficulties, is not open to dispute; but the particular evils under consideration are independent, in great measure, of the political constitution of Parliament, and are susceptible, if not of cure, at least of considerable mitigation. So much advantage has already been derived from changes of procedure which have attracted little attention, that sanguine anticipations may be formed of future improvements. It is understood that, in the approaching Session, a Committee will be appointed to consider every practical suggestion for facilitating the despatch of business; and we should be glad to see its deliberations anticipated by a general expression of public opinion in favour of the adoption of a more effective machinery for legislation.

A detailed examination of the experiments already made, and of further improvements suggested, would scarcely be acceptable to the readers of this Journal; but, without exhausting their patience, we may venture to indicate the principles which, in our opinion, ought to be carried into effect, and at least to glance at several specific recommendations which seem more particularly worthy of consideration.

No man of business will dispute the maxim, that, in conducting affairs, we should first settle what is to be done, and then proceed to do it. In practice, however, this maxim had been so continually disregarded in the House of Commons, that it became absolutely necessary to secure its more general recognition. No long time ago, every order of the day was subject to the interposition of irrelevant motions and debates. This irrational practice was subjected to considerable restriction in 1837; but it was reserved to the present Speaker to make the reading of an order of the day by the clerk, like the calling on of a cause in Court. No sooner is it read, than it is entered upon without any interlocutory discussion being permitted. The principle of this rule has been carried out, at his suggestion, with such signal advantage in the case of Committees of the whole House, as to require particular mention. Until 1849, whenever the House was about to resolve itself into Committee upon a Bill

or other matter, obstructive amendments could be interposed, and debates renewed, again and again, upon questions already affirmed by the House. This abuse, which was at variance with the spirit and intention of Parliamentary rules, has been corrected; and now, when any matter has once been considered in Committee, and stands for further consideration, the Speaker forthwith leaves the chair, with an alacrity that evinces his appreciation of the rule to which he is giving effect.

The value of this rule may best be elucidated by a recent example. Our readers will not soon forget Mr. Gladstone's 'Budget' of 1853. Introduced by a speech of five hours' duration, which established his position in the first rank of statesmen and debaters, its great financial and fiscal schemes demanded an entire Session for their development. No less than twenty-seven distinct measures were founded upon it; which, by the rules of the House, were required to be first considered in Committee. No ordinary Session would have been sufficient to bring such a code of laws to maturity, if, day after day, the going into Committee for their consideration could have been retarded by incidental discussions. But, dexterously availing himself of the protection afforded by the new rule, Mr. Gladstone secured the appointment of one Committee for the consideration of the 'Customs, 'Acts,' on which the greater part of his measures were founded; and no sooner had this Committee once entered upon its labours, than its repeated sittings were free from further interruption. No better illustration is wanting, of the political importance which may attach to a technical rule. Never were statesman-like views of public policy wrought out with more inflexible resolution than by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Ready at all points—never at fault either for facts or argument—seizing upon every opportunity to press forward the work he had undertaken,—he would yet have been powerless against the formal obstructions to which, under other circumstances, he might have been exposed. He had difficulties enough to contend with; and, in his race against time, any further obstacles would have been fatal. Either a part of his Budget must have been ultimately abandoned, or else other more important measures of the Government, which were continually thwarting him with unexpected delays, must have been postponed until another year. In either case, the political success of the last Session would have been rendered less complete, by a cause so insignificant, that it would scarcely have been detected by many of the statesmen who would have suffered from its operation.

An exception to this wholesome rule has still been retained, as regards the Committees of Supply, and Ways and Means; and

we have already noticed the heterogeneous collection of motions and amendments for which these Committees are consequently responsible. Day after day, when the proper business of the House is to consider the revenue and expenditure of the country, these frivolous questions are forced upon its notice, against the will of nine-tenths of its members. And this anomaly has been permitted in deference to the constitutional maxim—with which it is supposed to have some connexion — that the redress of grievances is to precede the grant of subsidies to the Crown. It is scarcely necessary to observe that this principle was first asserted, when Parliaments were summoned for no other purpose than the levy of taxes upon the people, and were dismissed as soon as the subsidies had been granted. The redress of grievances, therefore, could only be pressed upon the notice of the Crown, at the first assembling of a Parliament. To have parted with their money first, and then to have demanded favours, would indeed have been an odd method of striking a bargain: and the sagacity of our ancestors, sharpened by experience, led them to get whatever they could for themselves, before they agreed to be stripped of their 'brief authority' by the grant of a subsidy. Nor was the principle less vital to our Constitution, in later times, when a perpetual contest was waged between the Crown and the Parliament. We may be said to have bought our liberties with hard cash. When the Crown was not reduced by its necessities to demand a subsidy, no Parliament was summoned; when it could hold out no longer, this dreaded power was again called into activity, and, purse in hand, it wrung from unwilling and treacherous kings, the liberties of the people. Even now the same principle secures, with a force greater than that of any Statute, the annual meeting and uninterrupted deliberations of Parliament. The supplies are granted by annual votes, and are never finally appropriated to the service of the year, till the very last day of the Session.

How, then, would this principle, which is, in truth, the foundation of Parliamentary government, be endangered by restrictions upon the untimely discussion of matters wholly unconnected with either grievances or finance? It is not protection against the Crown that is wanting, but protection for the House of Commons, against its own members. The only result of the present license of debate is, that less vigilance is exercised in controlling public expenditure, than is devoted to the scrutiny of a Private Bill. The voting of the supplies is postponed till the very end of the Session; and is at last hurried over by the few remaining Members, in whom a sense of public duty has not given way before the pressure of fatigue and

private convenience. We would, therefore, apply the same rule to the Committees of Supply and Ways and Means as to other committees. Let them be appointed to sit at convenient times, and permit no interruption to their sittings. This change, however, should be accompanied by the concession of other facilities for bringing on motions, at more convenient times.

To complete the prohibition of interruptions to the appointed business of the day, one further regulation will be necessary. For many years past, Saturday has been observed as a day of rest for the House and its Committees — a Parliamentary Sabbath, as it were — for its overtasked members. It is not broken in upon more than two or three times in the course of a Session. Yet because it was formerly the custom to sit on Saturday, except by a special adjournment, the formal motion to adjourn from Friday till Monday has still been continued. On such a question there is not likely to be any difference of opinion; nor, indeed, can anything be said about it; but an obsolete form is rarely without its mischief, and accordingly it has become the occasion for an irregular debate upon every conceivable topic except the adjournment, to which it professes to relate. This abuse has met with so much discouragement from the present Speaker, that it is no longer so flagrant as we remember it to have been; but it should be prevented altogether. The remedy is obvious. Let the House resolve to sit on Saturday when necessary; and, at other times, let the adjournment be a matter of course. Mr. Bouverie was about to make this proposition at the end of last Session, but desisted, lest it should give rise to a debate, which at that time was, above all things, to be avoided.

When, by these changes, the certainty of the appointed business being considered at the proper time, has been ensured, precautions should be taken to secure the debates which follow, from unseasonable interruptions. It was suggested by the Speaker, in 1848*, that questions of adjournment should be decided without debate, and that a repetition of such questions, within an hour after a decision of the House, should be prohibited. And as even divisions alone, without debate, are very vexatious when persisted in by a small minority, he proposed that they should not be allowable, unless demanded by at least twenty-one members.

As the rules of the British Parliament were adopted in the United States and in France, it is not without instruction to observe the modifications which the experience of these countries

---

* Report of Committee on Public Business. Minutes of Evidence.

has suggested. So early as 1794, the American House of Representatives had discovered the inconveniences arising out of debates upon questions of adjournment; and the prohibition of them*, which was then found necessary, has ever since been acquiesced in. In like manner, the House of Representatives, having found by experience that the power of a small minority to insist upon a division is objectionable, will not permit any division to take place, unless one-fifth of the members present concur in requiring it.† The experience of the French Chamber of Deputies had led them to a similar conclusion; and a *scrutin secret* could only be insisted upon (except in certain cases) by the requisition of twenty members.‡ It will be for the House of Commons to consider how far restrictions, of a similar character, are necessary or desirable.

These foreign assemblies were also obliged to resort to measures for preventing the undue protraction of their debates; and, assuredly, not without sufficient cause. The debates in the American Congress have sometimes been of almost fabulous duration. One is recorded which continued without intermission from Saturday morning till Monday morning§; and, with less extraordinary sittings, many other debates, from day to day, have lasted for periods unknown in our own Parliamentary annals. In the French Chamber of Deputies, debates occasionally lasted for a fortnight, and even for twenty days.‖ It is not surprising, therefore, that in both countries a remedy should have been provided for an evil, at once so great and so ridiculous. In America, by means of 'the previous question,' and in France by '*la clôture*,' the majority were empowered to determine, by a vote, that a debate should, at once, be brought to a conclusion. This coercion of the minority into silence, has been quietly submitted to in America from 1789 to the present time; and in France it was borne, with equal patience, from 1814 until Louis Napoleon imposed silence upon majorities as well as minorities, by a *coup d'état.*

In 1848, serious apprehensions were entertained that the debates of the House of Commons would become as obnoxious as those of our French and American contemporaries; and the adoption of similar modes of repression, under improved forms, was under consideration; but latterly there has been less cause

* Rules of the House of Representatives, No. 48.

† Ibid. No. 4. ‡ Réglements 34, 35.

§ Report on Public Business, 1848. Evidence of Mr. Curtis, Questions 252, 253.

‖ Ibid. Evidence of M. Guizot, Questions 312, 313.

for alarm. The debates on Mr. Disraeli's House-duty, and on the second reading of the India Bill, which were the longest of the Session, each occupied four nights only; nor can we call to mind any recent occasion on which such a power as that of *la clôture* could reasonably have been exercised. The wholesome corrective of public opinion has restrained our representatives from such excesses as would have rendered more imperative restrictions unavoidable; and unless there should hereafter be an urgent necessity for interference, it is not probable that the House will consent to this limitation of its debates. In case, however, the question of *la clôture* should come under consideration, we are able to offer — what will be much more persuasive with the House of Commons than any argument — *a precedent.* On the 9th of May, 1604, 'upon Sir Rowland Litton's offer 'to speak in this matter, resolved no more should speak.'*

The Americans finding that even the 'previous question,' and some other rules of the same description, were an insufficient protection against the length of their debates, established, in 1841, 'the one hour rule,' by which every member was restricted to a speech of one hour. No exception is permitted, even in favour of the proposer of any question; and it is said that the rule has not only been successful in shortening the debates, but that it has improved their character. The sessions have been shorter, the legislation equally good, and the speeches decidedly better, and more to the purpose. The 'one-hour 'rule' is not without its advocates in this country; the veteran debater, Mr. Hume, being of the number, who, though himself the most frequent of speakers, would rarely suffer from the restriction he proposes for others. But unless long speeches should come more into fashion, there does not appear to be any sufficient reason for interfering with the discretion of individual members, in one of their most important functions. Frivolous and obstructive debates, raised upon formal questions, ought not to be endured, in spite of the political strategy occasionally connected with them; but *bonâ fide* debates, upon questions fairly submitted to the deliberations of the House, are deserving of indulgence, even when their length becomes inconvenient. In America the 'one-hour rule' had been tried on particular occasions for twenty years before it was generally adopted; and if the experiment were deemed worthy of a trial, an occasional enforcement of the rule would be the best method of testing its efficacy. There are many bills on which the speeches might be limited to a quarter of an hour in committee; and the Wed-

* Commons' Journals, vol. i. p. 968.

nesday morning sittings would also afford a good opportunity of initiating the experiment.

We believe that the House would be willing to acquiesce in any reasonable restrictions upon its debates. Nothing that has here been suggested approaches, in severity, the prohibition imposed some years since upon debates on presenting petitions. The presentation of a petition had long been a popular mode of raising a debate upon the subject to which it referred; but at length the evil of such irregular discussions, interfering with the appointed business of the House, and leading to no practical results, became intolerable; and members very generally acquiesced in their absolute prohibition. Yet, as regards petitions, it was plausibly contended that not only were the rights of members infringed, but also the rights of the people, as petitioners. Necessity, in this case, justified a departure from an ancient and popular custom; and the same overruling plea will more readily be admitted, in restraining mere abuses which have never enjoyed any popular sanction.

Among the expedients which have been suggested for bringing the Session of Parliament to a close, at an earlier period of the year, are a November meeting, and an alteration of the financial year. Prior to the Union with Ireland, in 1801, the ordinary time for the meeting of Parliament (though not without numerous exceptions) was in the month of November. From about 1805 until 1820 it became the more general practice for Parliament to be assembled after Christmas; but the Session usually commenced between the 14th of January and the end of the month. Since 1820 the more ordinary time of meeting has been in the first week of February. The time for assembling Parliament has thus been getting later, and meetings before Christmas less frequent, while the amount of business to be transacted has been continually on the increase.

If it were thought advisable to revert to the practice of November meetings, it would be attended with much less inconvenience than in the last century. To travel from Belfast or Inverness in winter, is scarcely more tedious now, than the journey from Bath or Cheltenham sixty years ago. But a meeting of Parliament before Christmas involves almost a double Session; and recent experience of its effects is very discouraging, as the latest as well as the longest Sessions have been those which commenced in November. The period before Christmas is too limited for any effectual progress in important measures; and unless some portion of the necessary business of the Session can be cleared off, the result obtained is not worth the undeniable inconvenience of an early meeting. The better

course would seem to be a meeting not later than the 15th of January, which would enable Parliament to dispose of all the preliminaries of a Session, and to enter upon the consideration of some of the principal Government measures, before the time at which it is usually assembled. If these measures have been carefully prepared, and be pressed forward with little interruption, a considerable part of the effective work of the Session might be accomplished before Easter.

Until 1832 the financial year had been dated from the 1st of January, but in that year the Government first submitted estimates for one quarter to the 31st of March, and subsequently the annual estimates from the 1st of April 1832 to the 31st of March 1833. The grounds upon which this alteration was made were explained by Lord Althorp on the 13th of February; and the debate on that occasion may throw some light upon the proposition, which has lately been made by Mr. Drummond, for reverting to the arrangements which it was then thought fit to change. Lord Althorp said,—

'By the course hitherto taken, the estimates had been proposed after a certain amount of the money had actually been expended; and of course that expenditure must have been made without the previous sanction of Parliament. It seemed to him an anomalous mode of proceeding that they should vote the supplies for the service of the year on estimates, although at the time the estimates were submitted to them, a part of the expenditure had actually been made. With the view of avoiding that anomaly, he thought it more consistent with the privileges of that House, and with the theory of the Constitution, that the estimates should be submitted for the ensuing year previously to the supplies being voted, and before the Government had spent any of the money.'

Sir Robert Peel observed, that, 'if the plan now proposed 'could be effected without inconvenience, it would undoubtedly 'remove a great anomaly;' but he remarked upon the practical difficulties that would be experienced in voting all the supplies before the 1st of April. These difficulties were fully admitted by Sir James Graham, on the part of the Government; but the 'change when effected would, he was sure, be found invaluable, 'and if the House chose to enforce it, would secure that real 'control of the House over the expenditure, which he desired to 'see established.'

This new financial year, approved by the Government, and adopted with the general concurrence of all parties, it is now again proposed to alter. The objects supposed to be attainable by reverting to the 1st of January, are an earlier Budget and measures consequent upon it, as well as earlier votes in

the Committee of Supply, the postponement of which, under present arrangements, unquestionably tends to the prolongation of a Session. The maintenance of our land and sea forces being dependent upon annual votes, early measures for that purpose are indispensable: and thus far the constitutional object of the change of 1832 has been reasonably well carried out. Although the army and navy estimates have not usually been voted, in detail, before the 31st of March, the most important votes, necessarily involving the aggregate estimate of expenditure, have always been taken, before the Government expended any money on the army and navy, for the ensuing year. The same principle might readily be followed out in regard to the civil services. The salaries and other expenses, payable out of the grants of the preceding year, are discharged on the 31st of March; and the first payment out of votes of the current year, is not due until the 30th of June. Here then are three months for the consideration of the civil service estimates—a time amply sufficient for ensuring the maintenance of the principle that no money shall be expended by the Government, until it has been voted by Parliament. Then why is it not done? Simply because, according to the present rules of the House, it is more difficult even to approach the Committee of Supply, than to bring any other business to a conclusion. If irrelevant motions on going into committee were prohibited, all the army and navy estimates, without any exception, could be voted before the 31st of March, and the civil service estimates before the 30th of June. And thus two important results would be secured by one simple regulation, the advantage of which, on other grounds, has been already noticed. The constitutional principle would be maintained, and the financial measures so far advanced, as to ensure an earlier termination of the Session. That such results should be attainable by so small a change of practice, is an illustration of the political importance of mere forms, and of the necessity of regarding them with the eye of a statesman.

A more important question than any which has hitherto been considered is, whether essential changes might not be made, with advantage, in the interior organisation of Parliament. The two Houses comprise upwards of 1100 members. Genius, learning, rank, ambition, industry, common sense, and practical experience, are all largely represented there. But are these numbers, and these various talents, so employed as to produce adequate results? Is there a sufficient division of employments, in the work of legislation? Do many labour where the well-directed energies of a smaller number would be more effectual?

Is the same work done again and again; and is it, at last, done well? These are questions worthy of grave consideration.

The political uses of numbers in the constitution of a legislature are, the representation of every opinion, interest, and party, and the weight which is consequently attached to its determinations. A small legislative body would be overborne by clamour and cabals, like a council of ministers: but a numerous body is strong enough to resist every influence but the popular will; and even that it is often able to withstand for a time. Abstractedly a thousand men will not arrive at juster conclusions than ten; and the ultimate judgment of the thousand is directed by a very small proportion of these numbers; yet, in a free state, the leading men would be powerless, unless supported by a numerous following of rank and file. It is power, rather than wisdom, that is the characteristic of numbers. The conclusions deducible from these considerations are these,—that it is the proper function of the whole body to discuss and determine the principles, and direct the general policy of legislation; while under its directions, and subject to its approval, a smaller body, with delegated powers, should be charged with the office of elaborating the details. This principle, though recognised in many of the proceedings of Parliament, is very imperfectly carried out. For many purposes the agency of committees is constantly resorted to; but rarely for the relief of the whole body, in the performance of legislative functions. Every Public Bill is considered on at least four distinct occasions in each House, and its several provisions are also discussed by what is nominally a Committee of the whole House, but which is, in fact, the House itself without its Speaker. Even when a Bill has been referred to a Select Committee, it is afterwards submitted to a Committee of the whole House. In the passing of laws the House does everything, and its Committees nothing: and this, we think, is a defective organisation of the means at its disposal.

A Committee of the whole House affords no relief whatever to the House itself: it occupies the attention of all its members, and no other business can proceed during its sitting. A Select Committee consists of a small number of members, generally not exceeding fifteen; and though well calculated for purposes of inquiry, does not sufficiently represent the opinions of the House, in deliberating upon any question of public policy. The determination of so small a body, arrived at without any public discussion, has comparatively little influence in restraining subsequent debates, upon the same questions, in the House itself. No other committee of an intermediate character, com-

bining the numbers and representative constitution of the Committee of the whole House, with the independent action of a Select Committee, is, at the present time, acknowledged amongst the institutions of Parliament. The Grand Committees of ancient times for religion, for grievances, for courts of justice, and for trade, were kept alive, for form's sake, for many years after they had ceased to be anything more than a name: but even their formal appointment has been discontinued since 1832. And the Committee of Privileges, which was of a similar constitution, still exists, indeed, but in a state of suspended animation. To revive committees which by common consent have been abandoned, would be a futile experiment; but the principle upon which they were originally established, may be applied to a new organisation of committees. Committees of the whole House may be retained for the consideration of all matters involving taxation, and other important questions specially referred to them: but Grand Committees should also be constituted, for settling the clauses of public bills, and for initiating various proceedings which now originate in committees of the whole House.

The organisation of such a plan might be attempted in the following manner. The House should be divided into six Grand Committees, consisting of about 110 members each, to whom would be added 15 or 20 ministers and other leading members, who would be nominated to serve upon all the Grand Committees. The members would be distributed by a Committee of Selection, subject to approval by the House, in such a manner as to secure an equal representation of political parties, interests, and classes in all the committees; and, at the same time, to maintain in each, a preponderance of members more particularly conversant with its peculiar department of business. Thus the Grand Committee for Trade would comprise a large proportion of merchants and of the representatives of commercial constituencies; and the Committee for Courts of Justice an ample complement of 'gentlemen of the long robe.' The constitution and functions of these several committees would be different; but all would be political representatives of the larger body, from which they are drawn, and little Parliaments, as it were, in themselves. The province of one would probably be Religion and Ecclesiastical Affairs; of another, Law and Courts of Justice; of a third, Trade, Shipping, and Manufactures; of a fourth, Local Taxation and Administration; of a fifth, Colonial and Indian Possessions; and, of a sixth, Education and General Purposes.

The first function of these committees would be to consider

the provisions of every Public Bill referred to them; and, for that purpose, their proceedings should be assimilated to those of a Committee of the whole House. Each committee should have assigned to it a chamber, arranged so as to admit of the distribution of parties, and to afford facilities for debate. It would be a novel experiment to admit the public and reporters to the deliberations of a committee; but this would be an essential part of the proposed plan. The main object in view is to invest the deliberations of these committees with as much importance as possible, and to delegate to them the discussion, and, as far as possible, the decision, of questions which now devolve wholly on the House. If this could be accomplished, the labours of the House would be, to that extent, diminished. Perhaps the number of days in the week on which the House would sit might be diminished: at all events the length of the sittings might be curtailed, and the two or three hours after midnight, which now inflict so much fatigue and inconvenience upon busy members, might be often spared. The tendency of such an arrangement would be to make the House a Court of Appeal, as it were, from its Grand Committees, rather than a Court of Primary Jurisdiction, in all legislative matters, as it is at present. It would determine the questions fit to be referred to its Committees, and would revise their decisions if necessary, instead of undertaking to settle the details, as well as resolving the principles, of all legislation.

Other incidental advantages may be anticipated from the reference of bills to Grand Committees. At present the discussion of the clauses of a bill is regarded, by the majority of members, as a wearisome interruption to the more proper business of the House. Few members take part in it; and those who attend are impatient to proceed to other matters, in which they are more interested. The bills are, therefore, hastily amended, while members who would be competent to assist in their revision, meet with little encouragement in offering suggestions to an impatient audience. In a Grand Committee, whose deliberations offered no impediment to the progress of business in the House, and whose proper duty it was to discuss the clauses of a bill, a more careful revision of them might reasonably be expected. The majority of the members would, probably, be interested in the subject of discussion; and those who desired to offer their opinions, would be heard without impatience. A grand committee, indeed, would be an admirable school for members, in which many excellent men of business, who are rarely heard in the House itself, would be able to render efficient service, and to gain distinction for themselves, by their knowledge and prac-

tical judgment. In each Grand Committee the Government would be represented by its official members who had charge of any bill, and by independent members co-operating with them; and the Opposition and other parties would have equal opportunities of advancing their own opinions. If their debates were published, the public would also be fully informed of their proceedings, and prepared to influence the ultimate decision of the House, when their reports should come under consideration.

The *quorum* of these committees need not exceed twenty, or at the utmost twenty-five; which would be sufficient for the transaction of ordinary business, while questions of importance would attract a full attendance of members. Their sittings might be conveniently held in the largest of the New Committee Rooms, which could be fitted up for their accommodation and, if necessary, enlarged by an encroachment upon adjoining rooms, many of which are of unnecessary dimensions. They would sit on certain days of the week, in the morning, and, like other committees, adjourn on the assembling of the House.

It can scarcely be objected that a Grand Committee would be too limited to represent, with fairness, the general sentiments of the House, so long as 40 members out of 654 are held to be sufficient for all purposes of legislation. Nay, by the present rules of the House, even 20 members, though opposed by 19, may bind the whole House to an irrevocable vote. Nor, in less exceptional cases, does the final judgment of the House depend upon the aggregate numbers in a division. For example, in the last Session, Lord Robert Grosvenor's Attorneys' Certificate Duty Bill had been brought in by a considerable majority in a House consisting of 391 members: it was rejected, on the second reading, in a house of 293 members only. And again, the fate of the Advertisement Duty affords a still more striking instance of the reversal of decisions, by smaller numbers than those by which they were originally agreed to. On the 14th April, after one of the very best speeches of the Session, Mr. Milner Gibson carried a resolution for the repeal of the Advertisement Duty in a full House of 374 members (the respective numbers being 202 and 171). The Chancellor of the Exchequer, however, at a subsequent period, instead of adopting this vote as the expression of the will of the House, proposed a reduction of the duty from eighteen pence to sixpence. This compromise was not accepted by Mr. Milner Gibson and his friends; and on the 1st July the battle was renewed. The Government at first succeeded in carrying their proposition by a majority of 10 only, in a House of 213 (the numbers being 111 and 101); and reversed, for a time, the previous decision of

374 members. Their triumph was brief. It was the night of a state ball at Buckingham Palace. The supporters of the Government hastened from the division lobby to the ball-room; while their sturdier opponents, resolute of purpose and not much given to dancing — even if invited to dance — continued the fight in a thin House of 136 members. It was now too late to rescind the previous vote directly; but being well skilled in fence, they succeeded in affirming, by a majority of 9 (the numbers being 72 and 63), that the future advertisement duty should be 0*l.* 0*s.* 0*d.*! After much consideration, the Government resolved not to disturb this determination; and we are indebted to 72 members and a Queen's ball, for our present complete exemption from a tax, which nearly one-third of the House had previously failed in repealing. The luckless attorneys were the only class who suffered in this contest; for Mr. Gladstone, in surrendering the sixpence on advertisements, begged hard for the Certificate Duty, as an equivalent; and for this sixpence the opponents of 'taxes on knowledge' consented to the sacrifice of their legal friends.

On numerous occasions, in every Session, the members present at a division are considerably less than one hundred; and a division with so many as three hundred is comparatively rare. To refer again to the last Session for examples: out of 257 divisions, there were 20 of less than 100 members; 142 of more than 100, and less than 200; 53 of more than 200, and less than 300; and 39 only exceeding 300. The average number present in all the divisions was 201.

In the presence of these statistics, it will hardly be contended that Grand Committees will afford an inadequate representation of the whole body of members. In the House, nothing can be more irregular and capricious than the attendance of members even when great questions are to be decided without further appeal: and it is notorious that the House is occasionally liable to clandestine surprises and ambuscades. The Grand Committees might possibly be exposed to similar irregularities; but every vote would be open to revision by the House; and their minutes of proceedings and division lists would show how far they had paid attention to their duties, and were entitled to support.

If the experiment of Grand Committees should prove successful in the case of Bills, it might be extended to other descriptions of business with equal, if not greater advantage. Bills relating to religion or trade, for instance, which are now required to originate in a Committee of the whole House, as well as other Bills, might more conveniently be initiated in

these committees; by which means the House would be relieved of many preliminary discussions. With what alacrity would the House refer the questions of Maynooth and the Nunneries to the Grand Committee of Religion! how gladly consign intricate questions of Law Reform to the Grand Committee on Law and Courts of Justice! And while much pressure might thus be transferred from the House, many members would have an opportunity of submitting their motions to Grand Committees who now wait hopelessly for a hearing, in the House itself.

Care would naturally be taken to prevent committees from withholding any matters from the consideration of the House. They would merely decide upon questions specifically referred to them, and their votes would be subject to reversal. Nor would ministerial responsibility be diminished by this system. If the committees were taken indiscriminately from the body of the House, the Government for the time being would ordinarily have a majority in each committee; and if occasionally outvoted there, would assemble their forces in the House, and refuse to adopt the report of the committee.

The examples of France and America are of little avail in estimating the importance of this experiment. The French Chamber of Deputies was divided into nine *bureaux* of fifty-one members each. The distribution of the members into *bureaux* was not arranged upon any principle of selection, but was determined by lot. Every month the names of all the members were put into a box, and drawn out by the President; and each list of fifty-one names, drawn in succession, constituted the nine *bureaux*.* Brought together by chance, shuffled and dealt out like a pack of cards, and again separated at the end of a month, the members of a *bureau* could scarcely be expected to evince any unity of purpose or effective organisation for business. Nor were such qualifications essential to the object they were intended to serve. A *projet de loi*, or other proposition, was referred to all the *bureaux* at once, and discussed by all. The minister, to whose department any measure related, explained its objects and policy to the *bureau* of which he chanced to be a member; and a conversation, rather than a debate, ensued amongst its members, sitting round the table. No reporters were present, and the discussions were ordinarily unknown to the public; but occasionally, when it served the

* After the Revolution of 1848, the National Assembly, being a more numerous body than the Chamber of Deputies, was divided into fifteen *bureaux*.

purpose of a popular minister or member of the Opposition—like M. Thiers—to give early publicity to his opinions, a speech, delivered privately in the *bureau*, would find its way to the newspapers. When the discussion was concluded, the *bureau* proceeded — not to vote for or against the proposition — not to agree to any report to the Chamber—but simply to nominate one of its members to serve upon a commission. Of course this member represented the opinions of the majority of the *bureau;* and consequently the nine members, of whom the commission was composed, became a fair representation of the entire Chamber. The object of the *bureau*, therefore, was to bring to a focus, as it were, the various opinions and suggestions elicited by nine independent discussions, in which every member of the Chamber had an opportunity of taking part. The Commission again discussed the *projet de loi*, and appointed one of their members to be 'the reporter,' by whom an elaborate report was prepared, for presentation to the Chamber, explanatory of the views of the Commission.

Notwithstanding the complication of this machinery, the system of *bureaux* has found so much favour in France, that, whether under King or President, it has continued to be a national institution; but, after all, it would seem to arrive, by a troublesome process, at results attainable by the simpler method of debating questions in the House, and deciding them, at once, by a majority.

In the American House of Representatives there are twenty-eight standing committees; twenty-two of which consist of nine, and six of five members each. With these committees originate nearly all the bills which are introduced to the notice of Congress. A member may move for leave to bring in a bill; but if his motion be agreed to, it is immediately referred to one of the standing committees, or to a select committee specially appointed for the purpose. Thus, bills never come under discussion in the House, until after they have been prepared or examined by a committee, when they may be presumed to be in a fit state for consideration; and, in this respect, the American system resembles that of the proposed Grand Committees. But the standing committees of the United States have other functions; as, for example, the examination of the revenue and expenditure of the current year, and military and foreign affairs, which in this country would be inconsistent with executive responsibility. Nothing of this description would be referred to the Grand Committees; but the example of America is useful as showing the extent to which the agency of committees has been made available, in the work of legislation.

We now approach a question of acknowledged importance, connected with practical legislation. Complaints have so frequently been made in Parliament, from the bench, the bar, and the press, of the hasty and ill-considered provisions of the public statutes,—of their loose and illogical arrangement, their obscure and often inaccurate phraseology, and their legal blunders, that our readers may claim to be spared any illustration of them. The modern statutes are not quite so bad as they are popularly supposed to be; but they are susceptible of very great and systematic improvements. Next to an epic poem, we believe an Act of Parliament to be the most difficult of all compositions. One mind, indeed, is rarely equal to the preparation even of a perfect *draft*, still less of a final legislative measure. Ready learning, patient study, practical knowledge, an appreciation of all conceivable circumstances amounting to imagination, logical discrimination, and the most critical nicety of language, are all essential to the due performance of the task. An Act of Parliament is not criticised like other works of art. Learned critics vie with one another to discover some hidden meaning in a chorus of Æschylus, which to common understandings has none at all; while the most subtle minds are striving to make unintelligible the language of statutes which, in any other composition, would be plain enough. No human skill will always be proof against such an ordeal; but by the present system of passing bills, a statute is exposed to so many dangers before it attains maturity, that we have often wondered, not that it should contain some obvious blunders, but by what happy chance it has escaped the enactment of sheer nonsense, in very bad grammar. However carefully it may have been originally prepared, no sooner is it out of the hands of the draftsman than its 'unities' are set at nought. A word omitted here, a clause added there, terms already used in one sense, inserted elsewhere, in another,—make such havoc in it, that its author would scarcely recognise his own work. Nor is he present to advise and assist in the amendment of his draft. It has been given over to the care of a minister or member, who, though well informed as to the general policy of the measure, has borne no part in the unthankful labour of its composition. To conciliate one member and make another hold his tongue, he would break the heart of the patient law-maker, who has pondered over every word before he wrote it down. The sudden thought of a conversational debater has more weight than the well-advised judgment of the learned draftsman. And should he be again consulted, it may be too late wholly to correct the errors of others. Amendments have been agreed to which can-

not be withdrawn with good faith, or have been voted by the House, whose decision may not be lightly set aside; and so the legislative patchwork is permitted to take its chance, with other performances of the same description.

The evil of thus disconnecting the lawmaker from the legislature is one that obviously needs a remedy. Bentham, impressed with the inconveniences of the present system of passing laws, went so far as to propose that a statute, having been prepared by official lawmakers, should be adopted by Parliament without amendment, or else rejected altogether. A proposal which gives Parliament only a veto upon the work of the draftsman cannot be seriously entertained; and even as an expedient for ensuring improvements in the mechanical part of legislation, it has little to recommend it. The lawmakers and the legislature would still be unconnected; and laws drawn up in the study, without the aid of public discussion, would rarely be fit for adoption without amendment.

Lord Brougham, the first of modern law-reformers, has repeatedly called attention to the defects of our legislative processes. He, too, attaches great importance to the functions of the lawmaker, and deprecates the inconsiderate amendments too often made in his work, by the legislature. In speaking of the treatment of his own Digest of the Bankruptcy Laws, by a Committee of the House of Commons, he says —

'No Committee can undertake with advantage the minute consideration of the terms in which provisions agreed upon as to their substance shall be couched. Confidence must of necessity be placed in the learning, skill, and diligence of those who have prepared the Digest.'*

For the remedy of the evils of which he has so often complained, his Lordship proposes the establishment of a board or court of learned and practised men — irremovable from office except upon the address of both Houses of Parliament — to revise the drafts of all bills before they are introduced, and again after they have been amended. Such a board, resembling in its character and functions the *Conseil d'Etat* of the French, has much to recommend it; but its constitution and its relations to Parliament would require grave consideration.

Parliament has already within itself the means of ensuring improved legislation with very little aid from without. Assuming that Grand Committees are to be appointed for the general

* Letter to Sir James Graham on the Making and Digesting of the Law, 1849, p. 5.

consideration of bills, a Sub-Committee, selected from each Grand Committee, might be charged with their technical revision. The Sub-Committee, composed of a few of the most practical members, and including some lawyers, should be attended by the draftsman, officer, or commissioners, who prepared the bill, and by the minister or member having charge of it. No bill should be reported by the Grand Committee until it had undergone this revision: and if amendments were subsequently made by the House, the bill might, if necessary, be again referred to the committee. This plan would bring into useful communication the lawmaker and the legislature, and would unite the practised skill of the one, with the political enlightenment and authority of the other. At present no responsibility is publicly attached to the draftsman. He works behind the scenes, like a newspaper writer, without personal credit or blame. The Government or member, by whom his work is adopted, enjoys the credit of success and the disgrace of failure. He would now become responsible for his own defaults. His pen which drew the bill, would also draw the amendments, under the directions and subject to the approval of the committee. Many heads would co-operate in the revision; but one hand only would hold the pen. Unity of design and expression would, at least, be secured by these means, and a competent lawmaker would generally be able to resist the introduction of unsuitable amendments. This simple plan, involving no charge upon the public, and little alteration in the existing practice of Parliament, would be productive of the best results. If, however, some official organisation were required, for assisting in the revision of bills and for maintaining uniformity in the work of various hands and different committees, this object might be secured in connexion with another important change of parliamentary procedure, which we are about to propose.

Many of the proposals we have hitherto made, though calculated to relieve the House and improve its legislation, involve, at the same time, a considerable enlargement of the duties of committees. And it may be asked, Are there not already too many committees? — and have they not more than enough to do? Has it not been said that thirty-three committees have been sitting on a single day? Then why add to the number? Nothing can be further from our intention. There *are* already too many committees — they *have* too much to do — of necessity they do a great part of their business very ill — and we propose to relieve them of the most onerous and the least satisfactory of their duties.

The large number of committees on private bills has been

noticed in our summary of the business of last Session. They form, indeed, a serious proportion of the engagements of members for about three months of every Session, and sometimes more. In 1846, there were no less than 123 committees on opposed private bills alone, the aggregate sittings of which amounted to the extraordinary number of 1048 days. The work would have occupied one committee nearly four years, sitting from day to day! In 1847, there were 88 committees; and their sittings extended to 720 days. During the seven years from 1846 to 1852, there have been 377 of these committees; and the annual average has amounted to 53, sitting for eight days each; and this in addition to very numerous committees on unopposed bills. On the whole, it may be estimated that between 350 and 400 members are occupied, about 10 days each, by services in connexion with private bills. Of their duties in a railway committee we need say but little: — they are too well known as difficult, laborious, responsible, and irksome, to need any illustration. But are they properly performed? — and could they be performed better by a different tribunal? In selecting the members to serve upon any committee, the principal qualification of the greater number has been that they had no pecuniary or local interest in the questions about to be considered by them; or, in other words, that they happened not to be shareholders in any of the companies concerned, or landholders in the contested district. Their impartiality being thus assumed, they are appointed to try some of the most important and difficult issues that can possibly come before any tribunal in the country. No judicial training or experience — no special aptitude for business, or familiarity with the matters on which they are about to adjudicate, are expected of any member of the committee, except perhaps the chairman. These are undoubted facts, which none will be found to deny; but on the results of the system there is still little unanimity of opinion. By many it is said 'to work well' — a dubious phrase, — to secure, at least, a greater number of just than of unjust decisions, and to give fairer play to enterprise and the rivalry of capitalists than could be anticipated from the exertions of any permanent tribunal. From others we hear nothing but ridicule and contempt. There is a favourite story amongst practitioners, of a young member, who had been sitting, for three weeks, in judgment upon the engineering merits of two rival lines of railway, suddenly arousing himself to ask, 'Pray what *is* a 'gradient?' And we have been assured by an eminent railway engineer that the following conflict of decisions, upon the leading principles of railway legislation, actually occurred in a single

week. The question to be tried by four different committees, sitting at the same time, and in adjoining rooms, was this: Which of two rival lines is to be preferred,—the shortest and most direct, or the more circuitous, which accommodates a larger population, more towns, and a greater traffic? The first committee preferred the shortest line; the second, the more circuitous; the third would sanction neither of the lines; and the fourth decided in favour of *both*. And this anecdote, however exaggerated it may be, serves to illustrate one of the chief evils of the existing system. The committees may be individually just; but how is it possible for them to carry out any uniform principle of legislation?

Another great evil is, that every bill has to pass the ordeal of two select committees — one in the Commons, the other in the Lords. There is no security that the principles of decision adopted by both committees will be identical, and much probability that they will be different. When an opposed bill has passed the Commons, the opposition may be renewed in the Lords. After the expense of an opposition has been incurred before the Commons' committee, and the committee have reported in its favour, the Lords' committee may find that the preamble has not been proved; and thus all the expenses of a successful contest before the Commons' committee are thrown away.

The great Railway Companies, whose parliamentary triumphs have generally conciliated their support of the system under which they have risen to greatness, are now beginning to calculate their past losses and estimate their future dangers. 'A most competent witness,' says the Committee of last Session on Railways, 'has estimated the loss of money to the railway shareholders, unnecessarily incurred in obtaining parliamentary authority for, and in constructing the railways now in existence, and in opposing rival schemes, at *seventy millions!*' Another witness informed the Committee that two thousand miles of railway, involving an outlay of more than forty millions, have been sanctioned by Parliament, and afterwards abandoned by the promoters, without any parliamentary authority. If to these be added the numerous lines which have been relinquished under the sanction of Parliament, it would seem as if the mileage abandoned were about half as much as the mileage constructed, which amounted in June last to 7,512 miles in the United Kingdom. In other words, for every two miles of railway authorised, and sufficiently well selected to be ultimately made, one mile of railway was either so bad in itself, or so ill-supported by its promoters, as to be abandoned with loss

to the greater part of the persons concerned. We will say nothing of the number of lines which have indeed been made, but much to the regret of shareholders, who heartily wish they had been abandoned. Their history is briefly told by the Share List.

These are great national evils, but the blame of them is to be borne by railway speculators rather than by Parliament. If two litigious parties insist upon ruining themselves in a Court of Justice, by endless suits, instead of adjusting their differences by arbitration or compromise, we blame not the Court but the suitors. But possibly they may be saved from themselves, and the various interests involved, render the experiment a national object. The railway property in Great Britain alone amounted in 1851 to 248,240,897*l.*, and the gross revenue upon this capital to 15,000,000*l.* We are persuaded that the aggregate capital invested in railways and other public undertakings sanctioned by Parliament, will soon be equal in amount to the National Debt, and this enormous property ought not to be endangered by the accidents and mischances to which it has hitherto been exposed.

With this view Mr. Cardwell, after investigating the difficult question of railway legislation with great care and judgment, proposed an improved constitution of railway committees, which is to be tried in the ensuing Session. His plan is to secure the services of a small number of well-qualified members, who are expected to devote a considerable part of the Session to their laborious duties, and by frequent communication to maintain uniformity of decision. This was probably the best expedient that could then have been proposed, with any reasonable prospect of immediate success. If more could have been done, Mr. Cardwell was not likely to shrink from the attempt; but the failure of previous experiments, the jealous regard of Parliament for its own jurisdiction, and the apprehensions of the railway interest lest any considerable change should diminish their influence or affect their property, forbade the proposal of a bolder scheme. We regard it, however, as the first insertion of the wedge, which repeated blows will drive deeper and deeper, until the entire system is rent asunder. It is 'the beginning of 'the end.' The new experiment is to be applied to railway bills alone; all other private bills, scarcely inferior in importance, being left, for the present, in their accustomed course. The system which has been condemned cannot be long continued: and of the new scheme we entertain no very sanguine anticipations. Its pressure upon unpaid members of Parliament will be intolerable; and we doubt if they will prove otherwise

equal to the heavy responsibilities imposed upon them. The new committee of forty will, sooner or later, be superseded by a more efficient tribunal, just as the Committee on Petitions for Private Bills, on the model of which it is founded, has long since given way to judicial officers of the House. Government Boards have been tried and found wanting; and we hope to see the establishment of a Judicial Court within the walls of Parliament, performing the same functions as committees on private bills. This Court should be common to both Houses, to whom it should make its reports, and thus the double inquiry, in Lords and Commons, now so vexatious and costly to the parties, would be avoided. Lord Brougham proposed a plan, founded upon this principle, in 1836; and the twenty-four resolutions submitted by him to the House of Lords embody, in forcible language, the reasons for the proposed change. The trial of this, or some analogous plan, may still be postponed for a few years, but we regard its ultimate adoption as inevitable.

We have now adverted to the principal inconveniences experienced in the practical working of our Parliamentary Government, and have endeavoured to indicate the nature of the remedies which appear to be wanting. The objects we have in view are not many, nor difficult of attainment. To limit the occasions for debate, without restricting its freedom; to discourage irregularities, in order to increase the opportunities for grave discussion; to organise the vast resources of Parliament, so as to diminish the labour and increase the efficiency of its deliberations;—these are the ends to be accomplished. The means proposed are simple and free from hazard, founded upon existing practice, borne out by experience, and not trenching upon any constitutional principle. Without giving undue facilities to a Government, or embarrassing the legitimate tactics of an Opposition, they would conduce to the dignity of Parliament, the credit, utility, and comfort of its members, and the public good.

---

ART. VIII. — 1. *Lettres sur la Turquie, ou Tableau statistique, religieux, politique, administratif, militaire, commercial de l'Empire Ottoman depuis le Khatti-Cherif de Gulhani.* Par M. A. UBICINI. Paris: 1853.

2. *Zustand der Türkei im Jahre der Prophezeihung*, 1853. Von HUBERT VON BOEHN, Königlich Preussischem Second-Lieutenant. Berlin: 1853.

3. *The Ottoman Empire and its Resources, with Statistical Tables, &c.* By Edward H. Michelsen, Phil. D. London : 1853.

4. *Three Years in Constantinople ; or, Domestic Manners of the Turks in* 1844. By Charles White, Esq. London: 1845.

We have selected these works from the enormous mass of literary compilations to which the present state of Eastern Europe has given birth, in order to combine in the remarks we are about to make on the same subject the testimony of competent writers from each of the three nations which have interposed their influence and their aid to arrest the doom of Turkey and to resist the aggressions of Russia. It would have been easy to call witnesses more adverse to Turkish institutions ; but we purposely avoid resting the opinion we have formed on the highly coloured statements of Mr. Macfarlane or the animated sketches drawn by Mr. St. John. The writers we have chosen are all rather friendly than hostile to Turkey: two of them have laboured in their several vocations to promote the reformation of the Empire. They are, therefore, qualified to inform us of the results which have attended their efforts, and their evidence may be received without a suspicion that it is biassed by any predilection for Russian interests. Before any correct opinion can be formed on the political bearing of this question, it is desirable to obtain as far as possible a clear and dispassionate view of the facts on which the duration of the Turkish Empire must depend. The events which have already kindled hostilities on the Danube and the Black Sea, and threaten to produce consequences so disastrous to the relations of the greater European Powers, are mainly to be judged of in reference to the social and political elements which have been thus rudely set in motion. The insolent and ill-judged embassy of Prince Menschikoff committed the Russian Government to a course of action from which it could not recede without discredit, and in which it could not advance without danger; for it had staked its ascendancy in the East against its alliances in the West, and either alternative resulted in a loss on the one side or the other. Negotiations followed, into which every court of Europe entered with an earnest desire of peace, but without a full comprehension of the magnitude of the question, and without a spirit of union sufficiently compact and authoritative to drive the Czar at once beyond the Pruth. At last the Turkish Government thought itself arrived at a degree of preparation which gave it an advantage over the Russian forces

in the Principalities or on the Asiatic frontier, and, without further deference to the counsels and remonstrances of the Allied Powers, it gave the signal of war, and trusted to the force of events to involve the rest of Europe in its quarrel. Upon these facts, which are patent to the world, and which may be said to constitute the three first acts of this eventful passage in history, we have little to add which is not already familiar to every reader, or which will not be discussed to satiety when the conduct of the British Cabinet in these transactions comes under the notice of Parliament. But the questions which have thus been raised, and most unreasonably raised, by the Russian Government, involve much wider considerations; and, as this dispute has slipped through the fingers of the diplomatists, and touched the fiery matter of creeds, nationalities, and armies, the debates which it may call forth on certain points of political conduct are of far less moment to the world than the formation of opinions on the future condition of the territories and the nations now visibly agitated by one of the great convulsions of history and of war. Everything concurs to render Eastern Europe the scene of one of the most extraordinary contests of our age. It is still partly inhabited and wholly governed by a people which owed its greatness to martial energy and sanguinary absolutism, but which is enshackled by the laws of a religion never yet professed by a truly civilised nation. Amidst all its pretensions to reform, every dispassionate observer of the state of the Turkish Empire brings back fresh evidence of its decay; and even those sanguine orientalists who speak of its progress cannot deny that the population of the Turkish race is rapidly declining — that the most fertile regions of the Old World are smitten with the curse of barrenness under their rule — that the cessation of the fierce and brutal control once exercised over the country by the Sultans has only secured greater impunity to corruption — and that the internal condition of the government and the empire is one of hopeless confusion. On the other hand, upon the northern frontier — from the river Pruth to the Colchian coast — lies that secular enemy of the Turk, whom the superstition of ages seems to have marked out as the inheritor of his dominions, and who affects to enlist in the cause of aggression the sympathies of the Christian Church and the institutions of a more civilised people; whilst Europe responds to these menacing demonstrations by a firm and united resolution, that whatever may be the fate of these regions they shall not become the undefended prey of Russia, and that, however difficult it may be to maintain a Turkish Empire, no Russian usurpation or conquest

shall transfer the empire of the East to the House of Romanoff. Between these contending parties lies the most interesting part of the subject,—the territory and the populations, who are at once the objects and the victims of the quarrel. In spite of the concessions of the Tanzimat to the Christian subjects of the Porte, and the more tolerant and enlightened maxims of the Sultan's present advisers, experience has taught the Christians how illusory are the hopes of civil equality, or even of real religious toleration, where authority is exclusively exercised by their bitterest enemies; and whilst the Sclavonian provinces tend to assimilate themselves to the condition of Servia, the Greek race aspires, from the Gulf of Arta to the Gulf of Volo, to assert its independence.

It has been said by high authorities that the perils which attend the opening of such questions as these are so great that we are bound by the paramount interest of peace to ward off a discussion so fatal to the public tranquillity, and that the maintenance of the *status quo* of Turkey was to be purchased even at the sacrifice of the progress of civilisation and the interests of Christianity. But whatever may be the value of that argument, it is materially diminished by the fact that, be it for good or evil, this contest is no longer within the grasp of diplomatic correspondence, and that in all probability, far from seeing the termination of this momentous dispute, the ensuing spring will greatly extend its proportions. The British Government was, we think, fully justified in the means it took to avert as long as possible a question which threatened to expand to such formidable dimensions; and our first interest was that no such controversy should, at this time, be opened. Even for the Ottoman Empire, whatever be the actual results of the war, which no human being can clearly foresee or define, any diplomatic solution endorsed by the Four Powers of Europe would seem to us preferable to the efforts made and the risks incurred by such a contest. But these are now vain regrets. The course of events lies to action. The stagnant waters are stirred, and the occurrences now succeeding one another in rapid alternation leave at least this conviction on the mind — that Eastern Europe is about to undergo large and perhaps violent changes, and that the state of things which has subsisted in Turkey for the last fifteen years, under what must be termed the joint protection of the Great European Powers, is already at an end. Turkey has shown by her declaration of war, and by her subsequent operations, that she had spirit to resist the threat addressed to her, and strength to defy the forces meant to intimidate her. She has preferred the risks of independent

action to the condition of a protected State, whose existence was obviously weakened by the precautions with which it was surrounded; and, to the astonishment of Europe, she has opened the campaign by more than one well-contested battle.

Yet we confess that even this momentary display of vigour, attended as it was at the outset by an amount of success scarcely contemplated by the warmest partisans of Turkey, does not materially alter the estimate we are led to form of the true condition of that Empire. We are still compelled to ask whether it be true that the Turk has materially altered his social institutions or his personal disposition, and whether the causes which have led to the progressive decay of the Ottoman Power have been eradicated, or whether they are of such a nature that none of the reforms attempted by Mahmoud and his son can effectually touch them. Upon a dispassionate review of the statements in the volumes before us, and in many others of the same character, rebutted only by the headlong assertions of a few French writers in the pay of the Turkish Government, we are struck by the large preponderance of evidence *against* the sincerity and success of this great experiment. A few of the Turkish pashas, who have acquired some of the tastes and opinions of Europe, and are supported in power by the influence of the European embassies, have recommended the wholesale importation of the instruments of European civilisation. Prussian officers have organised, not without success, the artillery of the Sultan, and improved, however imperfectly, the ordnance and fortifications of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles. French officers have assisted in the formation of a sham Polytechnic school, and have converted the brilliant irregular cavalry of the East into most ineffective lancers and dragoons. English naval officers of high merit have laboured to introduce the order and efficiency of the British service into ships of the line manned by crews that have never been to sea. Every kind of industrial speculation in mines, agriculture, and manufactures has been started at one time or another by the whim of the Turkish Government, and abandoned after a large unprofitable outlay. Whenever a partial success has been attained, and some results achieved, it has not been by the real progress of the Turks in any branch of these arts, but either by the intelligence of Greeks or Armenians in their employ, or more often by the direct exertions of English or French settlers in Constantinople. Never was a state so instructed in the infancy of its civilisation, or so nursed in the decrepitude of its age; and we owe the innumerable productions which load our table on this subject to the experience of a vast number of

persons engaged in these meritorious efforts. It is remarkable that not one of them in whose veracity and independence confidence can be placed ventures to boast of his success. On the contrary, there is scarcely one of these persons who have been brought to Stamboul by high salaries and the hope of a brilliant career, but tells the same tale of disappointment and wasted exertion; and although something has unquestionably been done to improve the material condition of Turkey, no such effect has been produced upon the Turks themselves. The magnificent situation of the capital, the inexhaustible resources of the provinces, and the intelligence and energy of the Christian population whenever they are properly directed, are such that Turkey requires little more than the permission of its rulers to become a flourishing country. But that permission will never be granted to it, as long as the form of political government remains what it now is; as long as the social institutions of the country are unchanged; as long, in a word, as the Koran is the fundamental law of the Empire.

It must suffice in this place to refer to a few of the more prominent of these abuses, which stamp the nation with incurable decay, because they are implanted in the very essence of Mussulman domination. There is no one fact which throws so much light on the social condition of a people as the tenure of land prevailing in any given country, and we regret that this subject has not been more fully elucidated by the writers and travellers who have described the state of the Ottoman Empire. If we are not much mistaken, the facts relating to this point alone would go far to explain the singular causes which have reduced the fairest regions of the Old World to barrenness, rendered the empire governing those magnificent territories a bankrupt State depending on the advances of usurers or the charity of strangers, and created a state of society in which everything is sacrificed to a dominant class and an exclusive creed, though in that class, and amongst the professors of that creed, scarcely a man of opulence or independent fortune is to be met with. 'Agriculture is still in the condition 'it was in some thousand years ago,' says, somewhat unadvisedly, one of our authors: but 'some thousand years ago' these same territories, on the contrary, supported a prodigious population where even the scattered Turkish villages suffer the horrors of periodical famine, and the splendid Empire of the Mede drew its treasures from the lands which will no longer support the impoverished government of the Sultan. The population is everywhere too scanty to cultivate the soil, yet the male inhabitants professing the Mussulman faith are almost

exclusively devoted to military service. The whole Moslem population is liable to be drawn for the army, and of those who are so drawn, not thirty-five per cent. ever return. The farmer is wholly without capital, and is commonly obliged to pledge his standing crops, at a loss of half their value. An attempt made last year by the government to lower the rate of interest in the agricultural districts to eight per cent., entirely failed; and the subsequent disappearance of the metallic currency has of course enhanced these evils. The want of roads is a complete bar to the transport of agricultural produce; and though the Turks continue to load every thing on the back of a donkey or a camel, from a hod of mortar to a cord of timber, a country in which every description of wheel carriage, down to the wheel-barrow, is still unknown, wants the first implements of rural industry. But the most significant fact connected with the land tenures of Turkey is, that at least two-thirds, and some writers say three-fourths, of the lands of the Empire are held in mortmain, as *vakuf*, by the mosques or pious and charitable institutions, either for their own use, or as trustees of the real owners. This property is subject neither to taxes nor to confiscation, and accordingly, it is a species of trust largely resorted to by private landowners, who transfer the fee simple of their property to the mosques, reserving only the usufruct to themselves and their heirs: on the extinction of the direct male line, the land passes to the charity.

'Immovable property,' says Dr. Michelsen, 'which is not owned by these institutions, of which, consequently, the State is the owner, and the private individual the holder, is called *Mulk*. Landed property (land, houses, mines,) can, in Turkey, be possessed only by Turkish subjects. A vakuf can, by law, neither be sold nor alienated, and it is only by means of an abuse and quibbling with law terms that any other immovable property of a similar description (which has not been a vakuf) may be substituted for it. Neither is the resale of the *Mulk* subject to less ridiculous restrictions. Thus, for instance, a Turk may dispose of his landed property to a Turk alone, while the property of a rayah is so limited by various clauses as to render its sale to all but a Turk next to impossible. The sale of such property being thus limited to a very small number of buyers, and these not of a wealthy class, the value of landed property is greatly depressed; while in some few places, where the Franks find means to hold property, (apparently in the name of a Turk, but in reality for themselves,) the value is raised to an extraordinary and almost fabulous extent. Landed property at Pera and Galata, for instance, fetches much more than in London.' (*Michelsen*, p. 178.)

This distinction may be considered to be the basis of the territorial and financial system of Turkey. Upon the conquest,

the lands of the Empire were divided into three classes,—a third for the mosques, a third for private landowners, and a third for the State. But the second or patrimonial division has been materially reduced, whilst the ecclesiastical portion has swallowed up the remainder. M. Ubicini describes the practice of these vacufs by the following example:—

'Suppose Said to be the possessor of a real estate of 100,000 piastres, which he desires to secure from the rapacity of the Government, and to preserve for his direct issue. He cedes it to a mosque, which gives him in exchange a sum of 10,000 piastres; but this cession is fictitious. Said, by a payment of 15 per cent. on the sum he has received, or 1500 piastres a year, continues to retain the perpetual usufruct of his estate, with a power of transmitting it to his children. He is safe from all confiscations and from forced sales, either by his creditors or by virtue of the right recognised by Turkish law, which gives the owner of contiguous property a prior claim to purchase. But if Said dies without living children, even though he have grandchildren to represent them, the estate passes to the mosque. Thus the mosque is placed by this trust in the position of a man who purchases an estate for one-tenth of its value on condition of only entering into possession on the extinction of the lineal and direct issue of the vendor, receiving, however, 15 per cent. on the purchase-money in the interval. It may readily be conceived that this arrangement contributed formerly to multiply these trusts, insomuch that *three-quarters of the landed property* of Turkey are thus pledged to the mosques, to the great detriment of the public revenue. (*Lettres sur la Turquie*, p. 270.)

These facts would almost suffice to account for the decay of the Empire. The fear of confiscation and the general insecurity of property have driven three quarters of the land into mortmain, where it is held by the double fangs of ecclesiastical power and legal subtlety, for in Mahomedan countries the lawyers are the priests. Being in this condition it ceases to contribute to the public revenue, except in the shape of certain objectionable taxes on produce, and it becomes inalienable. The only class in society who have the faculty of acquiring capital by industry are forbidden to invest it in real property, and the soil is carefully guarded against every change in cultivation or improvement. It is unnecessary to add, that wherever such laws as these are in existence, there can be no landed class able to take a part in the public service, or to supply men of independent position to serve the Government. Yet this state of things is based on the immemorial usages of the country and on the authority of the law of the Prophet; and it will probably remain unchanged as long as the Padischah is the sovereign of the country, and Mahomedanism the dominant religion and

law of the realm. If this be a correct description of the social condition of Turkey in this one particular, what are we to augur of its political institutions?

The government of the Ottoman Empire at the present time differs materially both in form and substance from what it has ever been before. The sovereigns of the House of Othman were, almost without exception, men of strong will and fierce despotic passions, wielding, without scruple, the tremendous power they possessed. If they wanted these essential qualities, they were soon removed by the Janizaries, who constituted what might be considered the military aristocracy of the empire. The destruction of the Janizaries in 1826 was incomparably the most important, as it was the most sanguinary act of Mahmoud's extraordinary reign, and, like the massacre of the Strelitz by Peter the Great, it was the precursor of a new era in the Empire. From that hour the Padischah wielded an absolute and uncontrolled authority, with which he braved even the religious denunciations of the ulemas and the prejudices of his subjects; yet this power withered in his grasp, and he bequeathed to a feeble son the feeble remnant of a mighty name. Abdul Medjid is a prince of singular mildness and benevolence of character, but utterly deficient in the intellectual and physical qualities of the ruler of a great nation. He soon became the mere nominal sovereign of the country, and all real power fell into the hands of the governing pashas, over whose gross corruption and incessant intrigues neither the law nor the authority of the Sultan exercise any control. The pashas constitute in reality a ruling caste, and all power is in their hands. Yet never was power more singularly obtained and distributed. With few exceptions (amongst which the names of Redschid Pasha and Fuad Effendi deserve honourable mention, as they are possessed of considerable cultivation), these pashas are men without the distinction or the advantages of birth, without independent fortune or position, often without the rudiments of education. They owe their rise to mere accident; some have entered life as the pipe-boy or favourite of a grandee, some have caught the eye of the Sultan as they sat working at their stall in a bazaar; a few have shown military ability. One of the most singular characteristics of Turkish society is the perfect equality held to prevail throughout the community. Every man is supposed to be equally qualified for every station, and the distinctions we draw in Europe from birth, education, or natural ability, are refinements utterly incomprehensible in the East. One man is a pasha, and another is a hamal or porter in the streets of Pera; but if they change places on the social ladder the result

is precisely the same, and no one is astonished at the rise of the one or at the fall of the other. Under this state of things, as no Mussulman makes his way in the world by the productive industry which secures wealth and consideration in other countries, all the importance he enjoys and all the luxuries he can command are due to the maintenance of his official position, or to the credit he derives from it. Hence there is not a public functionary in the country who is not openly accused of the grossest corruption, in addition to the large emoluments he draws from the state; and his life is spent, while in office, either in amassing plunder or in paying off the enormous debts contracted to Armenian seraffs under less favourable circumstances. The relaxation of the imperial authority and of public morality is such that no punishment whatever seems to fall on these offenders, though their Armenian accomplices are sometimes caught; and even the detection of a palpable fraud is not supposed to disqualify a man for holding the first office of the Empire a few months afterwards. For the same reason—an inordinate love and want of place—almost every one of these fortunate adventurers is more or less closely connected with one of the foreign embassies, and lends himself to foreign influence; and their course of action on the greatest questions of state is mainly regulated by considerations arising out of their own personal position, which commonly remain wholly unknown to the politicians of Europe. Nothing is more characteristic of this extraordinary system of spoliation than the proportion of official salaries to the general expenditure of the empire. Taking the revenue at about 7,000,000*l.* sterling —a sufficiently moderate burden on a population of 36,000,000, and an Empire which has about twice the superficial area of France — the pay of the public functionaries is estimated by Dr. Michelsen at 1,950,000*l.*, and the civil list of the Sultan and his family, at 834,000*l.*, without any allowance for the enormous underhand profits received by public servants of every class, by which probably one half the gross revenue of the state is abstracted before it reaches the treasury. Mr. White estimates the expenses of the imperial household at 1,250,000*l.*, or about one-fifth of the revenue of the empire. Well may Dr. Michelsen observe, in producing these figures, that 'the 'Ottoman Empire, though it has now existed for more than 'five centuries, can scarcely be called a state, in the proper 'sense of the word. The government of the past five centuries 'represents a system which is in Constantinople very aptly 'described as a "Nizam Altyuda haidad"—an organised system 'of rapacity;' and, in spite of some recent attempts at reform, we

believe this system to be unchanged, and that no effective system of control over the finances or of personal responsibility for public trusts is in existence.

The revenue is raised by the most vicious, unequal, and unproductive means. The principal source of income is a tithe of produce collected in kind in Roumelia and some parts of Asia, and commuted in the other provinces. Then comes an income-tax. varying in amount from 10 to 25 per cent., which is frequently imposed on the same produce that has already paid tithe. The capitation-tax, or Haratch, is paid by the Christians only, and is regarded by them as an insulting burden. The custom duties of the Empire produce only 750,000*l.* a year, and they constitute a further burden on the productive industry of the country; for whilst all merchandise imported into the Ottoman Empire pays a duty of 5 per cent. *ad valorem*, all merchandise exported from the Empire pays a duty of 12 per cent. These duties are still farmed by the Government, and the collection of the revenue is in the hands of gangs of Armenian speculators, who enrich themselves whilst they oppress the tax-payer and defraud the State. Laws have repeatedly been passed against these *malikianes*, as they are termed, but without effect, and the system remains unaltered. About five years ago, the customs of one large town were farmed for 1,500,000 piastres, and the contractor acknowledged he had gained a million piastres on his bargain. In the following year, he would have taken the farm at two millions and a half; but a member of the government obtained it for himself under the name of one of his servants, for 1,700,000; and then, wishing to realise his profits at once, made over his contract to the former holders for the sum they would have given for it. The State was thus robbed of 800,000 piastres; and the same abuses prevail in every rank of the financial agents. To take another instance quoted by M. Ubicini. The tithes of certain villages are farmed by auction. Some few days before the public tender, the great man of the district causes it to be known that he intends to bid for certain villages, and threatens with his high displeasure any one who may dispute them with him. The auction begins, and the farms are knocked down to the great man or his agent. The forms of the law have been strictly complied with. But when the public sale is over, the real transaction begins; the holder of the farms then proceeds to resell in retail the village tithes he has just purchased in a lump, and if he manages well he may succeed in realising a clear profit of 1,800,000 piastres on a sale of tithes to the value of two millions. These are not sup-

posed cases, but facts related by competent writers, who are defending what can be defended in Turkish institutions.

It has been justly observed by one of the numerous writers on the military defence of the Ottoman Empire, that to hold her vast territories, Turkey requires a good army, but that a good army cannot exist without good finances, or good finances without good administration. So another of the champions of the Sultan prescribes an admirable strategical scheme of defence, and adds, that all that is necessary to carry it into effect is a system of *good roads;* and this, in a country where nothing exists beyond a bullock track, even under the walls of the capital. In all these attempts to regenerate Turkey, the improvements have begun at the wrong end. As long as the laws and governing class are unchanged, it is impossible that the land should be other than a wilderness, the revenue honestly paid, or judiciously employed, or the rights of society protected. The present state of things is a scramble for private advantages of the lowest kind, and the idea of public duty to the collective interests of the Empire has scarcely a representative in the service of the Grand Signior.

Upon what basis, then, can the government of such a community be said to rest, when the idea of absolute power, founded on a divine commission, and defended by all the rigour of sanguinary force, has ceased to exist? The distinctions of birth are totally unknown: no family exists in the empire but that of the sovereign; and even family names are wanting. The distinction of permanent hereditary wealth is equally rare in a country where, till very recently, property has been habitually insecure, and where ample possessions usually caused the ruin of their owner and the downfall of his house. Every man who takes a part in public affairs belongs to that vast and rapacious tribe of functionaries who devour the revenue of the State, and the resources of the Empire. His career is diversified by plunder and prodigality while he is in power, and by debts contracted on ruinous terms when out of office. In the midst of the present crisis, and at a moment when every piastre in the imperial treasury was supposed to be devoted to preparation for war, it is a well authenticated fact, that the minister on whom the burden of public affairs mainly rested, availed himself of his vast influence to cause the Sultan to pay his private debts to an amount of 22 million piastres, or nearly 200,000*l.*, by allying his son to the imperial family.

The distinction of superior education, experience, or ability, is equally rare. Few statesmen of education exist in the country, for what the modern school of Turks claim to know

has been picked up abroad, and their superiority is viewed with neither favour or respect by their Mussulman countrymen. At this very time one of the ablest men in the Empire, Aali Pasha, is not in office, and Fuad Effendi has only been employed as commissioner to the forces. The truth is, that the choice of ministers, the ascendancy of one set of men over another, and the distribution of the vast patronage of the Empire, which is the sole support of the dominant class, are all regulated by party intrigues little known in Europe, and changes which have spread consternation and astonishment abroad may frequently be traced at Stamboul to the lowest vices and meanest passions of humanity. In the present state of affairs at the Porte all these intrigues are wholly unchecked. The Sultan is apathetic, kind-hearted, and easily deceived, and the time is past when the favourite of to-day might have his head struck off on the morrow. The pashas have the government in their own hands. They form a species of bastard oligarchy, limited only by the fanaticism of the ulemas and the exactions of the law, and, like all oligarchies, they govern solely with a view to the maintenance of their own power. To the honour of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe and of English diplomacy it must be said, that means have been found to turn even these contemptible instruments towards the improvement of the country, and to obtain from them those gradual concessions for the Christian population which will one day raise them, we hope, to the level of free men. The claim of Russia to a protectorate of the Christians in Turkey is the more monstrous, since every measure adopted of late years for their benefit has originated with the English or French embassies, and has been opposed by the Russian agents. Thus, in spite of the most untoward circumstances, the cause of reform in Turkey advanced, but it advanced by the weakness of the government rather than by its strength, and the efforts of the Divan to carry into effect some of its most praiseworthy measures were almost as injurious to its power and stability as the attacks to which it was exposed from without. The honourable refusal of the Sultan to deliver up the Hungarian fugitives who had sought shelter in his dominions was the cause of an interruption of his friendly relations with the Court of Vienna, and, perhaps, laid the first seed of that resentment which Russia has since manifested by the most violent measures. The attempt of the Porte to enforce the *Tanzimat* in Bosnia led to the revolt of that province in 1850, when Omar Pasha succeeded in crushing the insurrection by force of arms, but, at the same time, he destroyed the last remains of the power of those Bosnian sipahis who had been

for ages one of the best elements in the military force of the empire. The loan negotiated in 1852 in Paris and London under the auspices of the Greek envoys of the Porte in those cities, might have improved the financial condition of the empire, and would have strengthened the interest of Western Europe in its preservation; but, after the payment of the first instalment, the contract was annulled, and the money returned, whilst Prince Cantacuzene, one of the ablest diplomatic servants of the Sultan, was disgraced for no fault of his own. Power in the Divan fluctuated between bigoted, incapable, or corrupt ministers, and each succeeding month increased the difficulty of the question how an empire of so vast a frame, and so faint a vitality, was to be governed, or even preserved in existence.

Such have been the results of the experiment for the reform of Turkish institutions begun by Sultan Mahmoud, and continued during the reign of his son. But, though these reforms have not produced all the beneficial results anticipated from them, it cannot for a moment be contended that the old system of Turkish government could have been maintained. The struggle with Greece was the last effort of that merciless and barbarous domination, which was terminated for ever by the massacre of the Janizaries and the battle of Navarino. The time was past when Europe would endure to witness the subjection of a Christian people by means which perpetually reminded the world of the ferocity of the Turkish conquest, and the reigning Sultan himself accepted and ratified the new policy which raised his Christian subjects to the rank of human beings. They were emancipated by the Hatti Scheriff of Gulhani from the degrading conditions under which their forefathers had groaned since the middle of the fifteenth century. They have advanced with uncommon rapidity in industry and intelligence. Yet many of the most important franchises of social life are still withheld from them. The tenor of landed property by Rayahs is, as we have already seen, thwarted by Mahomedan law, and it is absolutely prohibited to all foreign Christians. The testimony of Christians is not received in mixed causes before the Turkish tribunals, and the great bulk of the population of the empire in Europe is thus degraded to the level of the negroes of Kentucky. This enormous abuse has lately been warmly attacked by Lord Stratford, and there is reason to hope that the firman abolishing so shameful a distinction has actually been signed, but there is a wide gulf between the signature of these firmans and their execution by the local authorities. The Haratch, or capitation tax, is still levied on the Christians in the most odious and insulting form, though a larger revenue

might doubtless be raised on a fair assessment of the country. And, lastly, the Christians are not permitted to bear arms in the service of the Government. An army which cannot move a step without the aid of Christian officers or renegades has not till now admitted a Christian soldier into its ranks, and the whole burden of war is thus thrown on the declining Mussulman population. These four causes constitute the primary grievances of the Christian races, and they are the key to endless injustice and oppression. Without those rights no people can advance beyond the limits of mere toleration; yet with them the Greek and Slavonian races would in a few years become the possessors of the soil and the lords of the Empire. Much as we desire to witness the progress of these liberal measures, it is impossible to suppose that such concessions would contribute to prolong the existence of a power founded on the exclusive domination of an armed minority, inferior in every other faculty to the people they govern. The Turks themselves are not insensible to their true position, and they say, with some reason, in answer to the demand made on them for further acts of toleration, 'Why 'should we grant further privileges to the Christians? Op- 'pressed as they are, and excluded from a direct share in the 'government, they alone find means to flourish amongst the 'desolation and poverty of the land. They are our creditors; 'we their debtors.' The most luxurious palaces on the Bosphorus are those of the Greek and Armenian families, except where those splendid abodes have been wrested from them by confiscation, and transferred to Turkish functionaries; and, although the scorn of the true believer for the infidel has only decreased in proportion to the decline of his own faith, he feels every year the increasing influence of the Christian races over the empire, and is perpetually reminded of the dependence of the whole of society on those members of it whom it still proscribes. This state of things has been repeatedly described by all the recent writers who have observed the state of Turkey, and we may borrow the following extract from Mr. White's 'Three Years in Constantinople' as a fair *résumé* of the case:—

'The motives that led to the framing of the Gul Khana edict, and the project of thereby reforming the administrative system of the Turkish Empire, were doubtless most praiseworthy. They were the creation of a benevolent and liberal mind, but not of a political economist conversant with the counter prejudices and correlative position of the vast majority of his fellow-countrymen, or with the objects and restless ambition of the minority. Before changing the character of the connexion between rulers and people *individually*,

and, above all, before attempting to imitate foreign institutions, it was essential to have considered how far these changes and imitations were applicable to the subjects of the Sublime Porte *collectively.* When the administrative reforms, now found to be impracticable or subversive, were introduced by Reschid Pasha, and applauded by Europe, when the representatives of European states became sponsors to these reforms, this preliminary investigation and forecalculation seem to have been neglected. The sponsors, carried away by over-liberal and philanthropic sentiments, looked upon the edict as a source of tranquillity and union between all classes of the Sultan's subjects, and its applauders reasoned as generous minds would naturally reason at a distance. Neither, however, appeared to have weighed the consequences with the consideration of men conversant with the elements of dissolution inherent in the projected reforms. Thence the necessity for modification and abandonment, and thence, in a great measure, the complaints of retrocession perceptible in the acts of the Ottoman Government within the last two years. Many of those best acquainted with the internal condition and component fractions of the Ottoman Empire have now modified their opinions. They are for the most part convinced that if it were considered useful and perhaps necessary to introduce some of the administrative *principles* in force in European states, it was impolitic and even dangerous to adopt the forms of these states, and above all, those of France.

'How different from that of France, or of any other European state, is the composition of the Turkish Empire! Its population consists of several distinct races utterly opposed to each other in religion, habits, descent, objects, and in every moral and even physical characteristic. The Turkomans, Kurds, Hurruks, Arabs, Egyptians, Druses, Mutawellys, Maronites, Albanians, Bosnians, Bulgarians, Greeks, Jews, and Armenians are so many distinct nations, who inhabit the same or contiguous soils without having intermixed in the slightest degree from their earliest conquest, and without having a single object in common. Indeed, in lieu of exhibiting the slightest signs of approachment or fraternisation, their mutual jealousies and distrusts daily increase.

'Over these dissentient populations stands the pure Ottoman race, the paramount nation, charged with maintaining the equilibrium between all and with neutralising the ascendency of one fraction by the aid of others. Were this control not to exist—were the Turks, who represent their ancestors the conquerors of the land, to be reduced to a level with those beneath them, or were the preponderating influence of the former to be destroyed by the elevation and equalisation of the latter, perpetual revolts and civil war would not fail to ensue. The dependent populations now constituting so large a portion of the empire would continue the struggle until one of them obtained the supremacy at present exercised by the Turkish race, or until the territory were divided among themselves or parcelled out by foreign Powers. Province after province would be lopped off from the empire, as already exemplified in Wallachia, Moldavia, and Servia, and this, with the sanction and under the protectorate of

powers the most clamorous for institutions replete with these elements of dissolution.

'The dangers that would menace the stability of the Sultan's authority present themselves under other forms than those above mentioned. Should the line of demarcation which now separates the different component parts be removed—should a closer connexion take place between the jealous and rival populations now subjected to the domination of the Porte—should the mutual aversions that now separate them be softened by equality of privileges—should all be raised to the same standard as their masters—it is to be feared that they would soon come to an understanding, and unite against the Turkish race, of which all are equally jealous, and against which all entertain the same sentiments of ill will and animosity. Many benevolent men argue that the surest means of tranquillising the tributaries of the Porte, and of attaching them to the Government, is by raising them in the social scale, and by granting to all the same rights and immunities as are enjoyed by the rulers. But it has been repeatedly proved, that concessions do but lead to fresh demands, and that partial enfranchisement conducts to total emancipation. Besides, when commerce, industry, intelligence, knowledge, activity, rapidly augmenting population,—in short, all the ingredients and incentives to progress and liberty are on one side, and when comparative ignorance, prejudice, apathy, aversion to speculation and foreign trade, with stationary population are the characteristics of the other, it is fair to argue that many years would not elapse before the progressing fractions would take the lead, and rulers and ruled would change places.'

In a word, the contest which is going on is that of civilisation and barbarism, of legislative rights and arbitrary power, of Christianity and Islamism, of the races of Europe and the races of Asia, and it is only by the maintenance of conditions the most onerous to the cause of numbers, of truth, of progress, and of freedom, that the balance can for a moment be maintained. Place the Christians and the Mahomedans of Turkey in Europe on terms approaching to equality, and the result would not be doubtful for a single year. Thus far the question may be said to have advanced, that few statesmen will now be found to advocate the justice of such a state of things in the abstract, though they still cling to the expediency of a system of government which can only be preserved by means that every free and civilised man must abhor.

But in reality the expression by which this state of things is diplomatically described has long ceased to have any true meaning. The integrity and independence of the Ottoman Empire became little more than a conventional form of words from the moment it was used to describe, not the actual condition of Turkey, but the forbearance of Europe. Already province

after province had been torn from the Ottoman dominions. The Crimea was lost; Bessarabia is incorporated with Russia, and her frontier advanced to the Pruth; from Moldo-Wallachia the last remnant of the Mussulman race has been expelled by treaty; Servia has a government and constitution of her own; Greece has been made a kingdom; Algeria a French province; Syria has only been restored to the Sultan by a party of British marines; and the tenure of Egypt is that of all but independent alliance. In a word, the Porte has already lost what she could not defend; and her losses would have been greater but for the support she has received from Europe. But that support has compromised her independence, whilst it has saved a part of her dominions. The contest now going on at Constantinople is not so much a *bonâ fide* assertion of the independence of the Porte, as a struggle between the supremacy rashly claimed by Russia and the influence which the Western Powers are pledged not to relinquish. If it were possible to penetrate the secrets which diplomacy prudently conceals from the world, we should be curious to ask which of the Turkish state papers have been written by Mussulman plenipotentiaries, which of the important measures lately taken originated with the Divan, except, indeed, when they used their independence to defeat the pacific labours of Europe, and to draw the Christian Powers as nearly as possible to a state of war which threatens to engulph themselves? Much that has been said and done in the name of the Turkish Government has been exceedingly able, politic, and judicious; but we are surprised that any of the politicians who have warmly espoused their cause should have been deceived by so palpable a contrivance. It is the old fable reversed, and the lion is hunting in the ass's skin. If these exotic and adventitious aids were withdrawn, we doubt not only whether Turkey would resist Russia for another campaign, but whether the Empire itself would hold together as long. The very facts which are now alleged in support of the independence of Turkey are proofs of her entire dependence on foreign counsels; and the only favourable solution of this problem which we can imagine, would be that these foreign counsels should gradually so transform the Empire that a Christian state, capable of self-government and of self-defence, should be formed on what we must now term its ruins.

We are thus led to consider the state of the Ottoman Empire as it is; and the story is not a new one. We see a once mighty and formidable state in great weakness, from the gradual but steady decline of that dominant race which founded its authority and alone defended its power. If the Government has recourse

to its Christian subjects, by extending to them equal civil rights, and by including them in its armies, their superior numbers and intelligence would ere long overwhelm the Turks, and the Empire of Islam in Europe would be at an end. Depressed by the failure of its original powers, and not daring to throw itself upon the doubtful allegiance of the Christian population, its last resource is in foreign succour. And this succour is afforded it, not so much because we are interested in the preservation of Turkish despotism and Mussulman supremacy, as because Europe cannot permit that these institutions should be swept away only to make room for the despotism and the religious supremacy of Russian Czars and the Russo-Greek Church. On that point we are perfectly agreed with the most strenuous supporters of the Ottoman Empire; but we agree with them because, behind the fallacious and questionable 'integrity and 'independence' of Turkey, there is a real interest of paramount importance to Europe, namely, the independence and future welfare of the territories and races over which the Turk still holds sway. They will remain long after the crescent has ceased to glitter on this side the Hellespont; they must form a state, under whatever name, which is every year more closely allied to the interests of Europe; and to determine the nature and form of that state now or hereafter is the greatest problem with which the statesmen of our age have to deal.

But here again the question is complicated by several irreconcilable elements. The Christian population of Turkey in Europe (for it is to that part of the empire that our remarks are chiefly addressed) is divided into the two great classes of the Slavonian and the Greek races, neither of which can govern the other; and the position of the Slavonian provinces is rendered still more perplexing by the fact that there are in Bosnia 700,000 or 800,000 European Mussulmans, originally converted to Islamism by Turkish conquest, but now justly reckoned amongst the most brave and fanatical of true believers. That province is, indeed, the only instance in which Mahomedanism seems to have engrafted itself with any firm hold on a European stock, and there the martial ardour of a people nearly connected with the Croats and Pandours is allied to the ferocity of that most intolerant creed. In a neighbouring principality, however, one experiment of self-government has been made with success. The condition of Servia is far superior to that of any other province still tributary to the Porte. With the exception of the investiture of the Prince, the annual tribute, and the garrison of six fortified places, Turkey is debarred by treaty from all interference in that country, and no Mussulman can inhabit its

soil. Accordingly the progress of Servia has been rapid. Institutions have been framed, peculiar in their character, but adapted to the manners of the people; the revenue is flourishing; the government is popular; and this province forms the strongest contrast to the general condition of the Empire. Possibly there may be in Servia the nucleus of an independent Christian state, for although the people are strongly hostile to the slightest approximation to Turkey, and would declare in favour of Russia if pressed to take part in this war, yet they are no servile adherents of Russia; and the views of the leading Servians are much more directed to an extension of their own political rights over the neighbouring territories. In these provinces the same idea, under the name of the Illyrian kingdom, has been most earnestly propagated, and the elements of a revolution, or declaration of independence, exist there, alike opposed to Russian ascendancy and to Turkish authority.

These races, however, inhabit the least civilised portion of this quarter of the globe. They have frequently displayed their hereditary valour in the ranks of the imperial armies, and under different standards, but many centuries have passed away since their national existence was absorbed in the torrent of Mahomedan conquest, and they have yet to reconquer a place in the civilised world. Not so the Greeks. In spite of centuries of servitude and persecution, in spite of the oppression which has too often degraded them into the tools and sycophants of their masters, in spite of the vices which bad government has added to their natural failings, they remain, beyond all comparison, the most intelligent, enterprising, and energetic people of Eastern Europe, and they are hourly becoming more impatient for emancipation and independence. Thirty years have not yet elapsed since the sudden uprising of the Greek race filled the world with astonishment and enthusiasm. The most adventurous of our soldiers joined the Christian colours; the most romantic of our poets wrote and died in their cause; and the heroic achievements of that band of patriots burst at last through all the obstacles of a Tory government and the Holy Alliance: the Greek revolution was recognised by Europe, — Europe declared that Greece should be free. When that memorable decision was taken the fate of the East of Europe was decided, and no subsequent wavering of policy will reverse the decree. It is true that on both sides much has occurred to shake the faith of Europe, and especially of this country, in the Greek cause. We ourselves are not the least culpable parties. We concurred in the selection of an incapable prince, foreign alike to the creed and the manners of the people; we surrounded his boyhood with

a regency of Bavarian councillors who quarrelled from the day they set foot at Nauplia; we encumbered his finances with a loan, small part of which was spent for the benefit of Greece; we narrowed the frontiers of the new kingdom so as to exclude from it many of the most famous and gallant champions of the national cause, such as Samos, Chio, and Suli, and to reduce its resources to the smallest limits. Having done all this, Athens has ever since been made the scene of contemptible intrigues between the three Powers, in which our envoys have not always played a conciliatory part. On the other hand, the conduct of the Greeks has frequently been unwise, sometimes scandalous. The Court has given its confidence to what is least honourable in the country; and the state of the kingdom of Greece is far below what it ought to be — below even the condition of some of the Greek islands still under the Turkish dominion.

But this temporary and partial failure of an experiment of twenty years, — a short fraction of time in the annals of a people which dates from Cecrops, — is a mere speck on the general question. The Greeks themselves, both within the frontiers of the kingdom and beyond it, think of King Otho and his court as we do, but they do not consider him as any permanent obstacle to their progress. At present the chief indication of that progress is their astonishing aptitude for commerce. Throughout the Levant an incredible activity prevails among the Greek traders. Towns have sprung up on islands depopulated by the war, vessels are built, large firms are established, and the entire business of the Levant is in their hands. Not content with these undertakings, they have thrown out their branches to the ends of the earth, with an energy which we can only compare to that of our fellow-countrymen in this portion of the island. More than sixty Greek houses now in London form a commercial colony of the first importance, which has possessed itself of the whole trade of the Levant, and of four-fifths of the foreign corn trade of England; and in spite of the equivocal character attached to the Greeks in the East, where every man lives more or less by plunder or fraud, it is worthy of remark that on English soil these houses have established a high character for honesty, and not one of them, we believe, has been wanting to its engagements. From London they have advanced to Manchester for their supplies of cotton goods; and, more recently, to Rio Janeiro, Calcutta, and Australia. Similar colonies have been formed at Marseilles, Trieste, and Odessa; and the operations of these houses, all retaining some connexion with Greece, are becoming an important element in the commerce of the world.

What will occur in the next generation, when the sons of these merchants find themselves already rich by the labours of their family, educated in the arts and liberties of the West, yet attached by their lineage and their ambition to their Greek country? Already the monied resources of this class of Greeks furnish resources, not illiberally provided, for the future struggles of their country, since they are the only people of the East (except the Jews) who can be said to have wealth at their command. Nor are they deficient in the strongest feelings of patriotism. Not one of them looks with indifference to the time when the Christian races of the East will be free, and the Christian Church of the East mistress of her ancient domain. At this time, especially, throughout the Greek population of those lands, and amongst their countrymen all over the world, there is a deep-rooted conviction that the day of their great struggle and final victory is at hand. As opposed to the Turks, the hereditary enemies of their faith and their nation, the wishes of the Greeks are, we believe, almost to a man, with the Russians in the present contest. But it must not be imagined on that account that they are the more disposed to exchange the yoke of Turkey for that of Russia, or to accept any condition but that of national independence. Their commercial interests, based on freedom of trade,—their maritime pursuits, which connect them with the Western Powers,—their Church government, which will never submit to recognise the supremacy of the Russian Synod,—and their geographical position, always accessible to the fleets and forces of England and France,—are causes that sever them from the dominion of Russia; and we confidently affirm that no means of government Russia has yet exhibited to the world would retain her authority over the Greek people. Their own energy and the interests of the Western Powers will secure their independence; but not all the counsels and remonstrances of the allied powers will suffice to prolong their subjection to Turkey; and the first opportunity afforded by a reverse of the Ottoman armies will probably be responded to from the Acroceraunian mountains to the Archipelago, by a people who have shown before this how they can fight for their freedom.

There is yet another characteristic of the modern Greeks, interesting at once from its analogy to their past history and as an indication of their rapid improvement. They are the only people of the Levant who attach a lively importance to education. We have seen that the attempts to instruct the Turks in the acquirements, the arts, and the military exercises of Europe end as they began, by the forced labours of a few im-

ported masters and the superficial distinction of a few reluctant scholars. The Slavonian provinces are comparatively barbarous, or tinged only with the morality of French novels and the politics of French communism. But in Greece education is a passion in almost all ranks of society. The primary schools are excellent, and assiduously frequented. The university of Athens is already in possession of a distinguished body of professors. The Greek language is spoken and written with far greater purity and elegance than it was twenty years ago; the use of foreign corruptions is viewed with scorn by educated Greeks; and the original language of Homer and the New Testament may be said to be the basis of the instruction of this people. There are examples in Athens of peasants who have come in from the fields to take domestic service in the city without wages, asking no remuneration but leave to attend a school two hours a day. King Otho's government has done little or nothing to promote or assist this laudable enthusiasm, and amongst the favourites of the Court, and even the Ministers of the Crown, there are still men who can scarcely write their names. But in this, as in other respects, the government is a libel on the country, and it is easy to foresee what must be the ultimate consequence of this ardour of intelligence and this feverish activity of the Greek character, when opposed to races sunk in total apathy, and degraded by profound ignorance. It is doubtless in the interest of the Christian population of the East to check as far as possible any premature attempt to secure their emancipation, which might, if it failed, defeat the progress of measures calculated to improve their condition by pacific means. Indeed, the happiest solution of the Eastern question would be the gradual transformation of the Ottoman Empire by the concession of equal rights to the Christians, until, to use the expression of a Prussian diplomatist, 'Il ne resterait 'plus qu'au Grand Seigneur de se faire Chrétien.' But the Turks are too well aware of their own inferiority in every particular except that of military force to place their ascendancy at the mercy of their Christian subjects. The Rayahs subjects are still too much exposed to every species of oppression and insult to endure this yoke one hour after they think they can shake it off. Habits of toleration and decrees of equality are a dead letter beyond the diameter of the capital; and we venture to affirm that more acts of cruelty and extortion are still perpetrated in the Turkish Empire than in all those countries of Europe which habitually inspire us with the strongest commiseration. Within the last ten years wholesale massacres of Christians have taken place in

Asia Minor. The slave-trade is still carried on upon a large scale, in spite of the prohibition of it by law; for the menial servants of Constantinople are negroes imported from Northern Africa, and the white slave-trade in Circassian girls still flourishes amongst the crimps and panders of Tophana. Nay, even the domestic hearth of the Greek subjects of Turkey cannot secure their daughters from the last insults, and many a Greek girl is still consigned to the soul-debasing captivity of the Harem under the pretence that she has renounced the faith of her fathers, and embraced that creed which dooms her to perdition. A conversion to Islamism, whether forced or voluntary, extinguishes all the ties of nature itself.

The safety and the policy of all Europe require a barrier against Russia; and it is a maxim of permanent interest to the British Empire that she should not extend her territorial jurisdiction over the East, or acquire a maritime power continually threatening the Mediterranean states and the road to India. But of what materials is that barrier to be composed? Can we expect that any permanent resistance to one of the first military empires of the world will be offered by a state with an anomalous and corrupt government, a declining population, exhausted finances, and a half-organised army? The barrier against the encroachments and ambition of Russia or any other Power must undoubtedly be raised on the soil now possessed by the Turks, but it will never be secure until it be defended by a fresh, vigorous, and intelligent people. For, we repeat, the Christian populations of the East have no intention to change one oppressive form of government for another; and though they may borrow the aid of the Russians to shake off the yoke of the Turks, they are not more disposed to be the subjects of the Czar than of the Sultan. It is a common error to suppose that the analogy which exists between the Church of Russia and the Churches of the East is a powerful bond between these communities and the Russian Crown. The Emperor of Russia himself, in claiming the protectorate of Greek subjects of the Porte, as a right due to the ancient solicitude of the Czars for the whole Eastern Church, attempted to give weight to this delusion. But nothing can be further from the truth. The strongest characteristic of the Eastern Churches is their national spirit, in which they resemble our own; but they differ from the Church of England by the entire independence of their ecclesiastical authority, as exercised by the Patriarchs and Synods of Constantinople, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria, to which must now be added the Synod of Athens. These Churches assert,

and have ever asserted, from the days of the seven first Œcumenic Councils, their equal and independent rights; but on that ground, much more than on the narrow question of doctrinal difference, they denied the supremacy of Rome, and to this hour their detestation of the Papacy is as bitter as it has been in any former period. Does any one suppose that a clergy or a people who resist to the death the supremacy of Rome, will accept the supremacy of the Synod of St. Petersburg? or, that a Church, boasting of independent government by its Patriarchs from apostolic times, and even through the dark ages of Turkish bondage, will acknowledge the Emperor of Russia to be its head, or submit to the Erastian condition of the Russian establishment? Throughout the Eastern populations, both Slavonian and Greek, these religious elements have undoubtedly enormous power. There, far more than in Western Europe, they are likely to become the guiding principle of great political events. But, dear as the Churches are to the faith of the people, they are not less dear as the symbols of national independence; and from that point of view, neither Greeks nor Slavonians are more ready to merge their apostolic confession in the ecclesiastical ordinances of St. Petersburg or Moscow, which they justly regard as Churches of inferior rank and antiquity, than they would be to place themselves under the control of the Russian police or the dreadful conscription of the Russian army. On the contrary, if these countries were emancipated from the Turk and in possession of a free church and a free constitution, it is probable that their independence would be as zealously defended against Russian supremacy, as against the insidious aggressions of Rome. The Church of the East has at all times repudiated the subjection of her liberties to foreign authority, and whilst Rome centralised the Western world, she lost her control over the oldest Churches of Christendom. The discipline of the Latin Church is a formidable weapon in the hands of those powers which have sought to crush the traditions of national freedom; but the Greek Churches have, on the contrary, successfully defied every form of central authority which has been directed against them, and when every other species of independence was lost, the Church still preserved the existence of the nation.

We support the Turkish Government against the unjust pretensions of Russia, and we do well, because we cannot be indifferent to the destruction of that concert of the Great Powers which has prevailed for many years in the affairs of the East; we cannot assent to the forcible detention by Russia of a foreign territory; and we cannot admit that she has claims to

the protection of the Christian subjects of Turkey superior to those of the other Christian Powers. But our position is one of extreme difficulty; for it cannot be the policy of England or France to throw the Christian subjects of Turkey entirely into the arms of Russia by backing the high Mussulman party in its unqualified resistance to demands made ostensibly and speciously for their benefit. On the contrary, the high Mussulman party are our habitual opponents, and Redschid Pasha has in all his successive ministries been their constant antagonist. In that capacity he was considered during the past summer to be the Minister most favourable to peace, and most awake to the dangers of the war which the ulemas and his own political rivals were resolved to provoke. In the course of these negotiations, Redschid Pasha seems to have discovered, however, that the war party was getting too strong for him, and he had not the moral courage, perhaps he had not the physical force, to resist the storm which was rising against him in the Divan, and even, as was said, among the people. Towards the close of September he convoked an assembly of an almost unprecedented character in Turkey, for it consisted of no less than 172 of the chief officers of the state and the heads of the law. No doubt existed as to the decision of such a body. It was, in fact, unanimous—that is, the opinion of the minority was unexpressed. The ministers retained office, but they remained to execute the designs of their rivals, and to pursue all the hazards of war. The mosques were ready to open their stores; the treasure reserved for the sacred cause of war against the infidel was appropriated to the public service; and Omar Pasha took the field at the head of an army far exceeding in numbers and in discipline the expectations of the friends of Turkey or the apprehensions of her enemies. Thus far his operations have not been defeated, and we are unwilling to predict a too speedy reverse. But it is not the less true that the extreme war party, directed by the ulemas, has prevailed, not only over the more cautious policy of Redschid Pasha, but even over the intentions of the Christian Powers; and that we shall, ere long, have to consider the effect of this policy, not only on the quarrel with Russia, but on the Christian populations of the Empire. Whatever may be the abilities of Omar Pasha, it may be said of him as was said of the far more brilliant triumphs of Heraclius, that the Empire has been rather exhausted than exercised by these efforts. Troops have every where been withdrawn from the provinces; in many parts of the country a total want of security and authority already prevails; and as soon as the Ottoman forces meet with any serious

reverse, they will probably find that the Russians are not their most formidable enemies. If such a movement on the part of the Christian populations does take place, as we may anticipate that sooner or later it will take place, it would become impossible for the two most enlightened states of Western Europe to support the cause of Mahomedanism, despotism, and barbarism, against the just demands and growing strength of an overwhelming majority of the people. This, we shall be told, is not the present question. True, but it lies behind it, and in close connexion with it: and with a view to the permanent settlement of the East, it is of more importance perhaps than the recent aggressions of Russia. Indeed, if we were to seek any deep-seated political motive for the extraordinary proceedings of the Russian Cabinet towards the Porte, it might perhaps be found in the increasing evidence that the Christian populations of the south were outgrowing in intelligence and wealth the tutelary power Russia has assumed over them. We need hardly express our concurrence in all measures necessary to keep the Russians *out* of Constantinople, and to resist the pretensions they have raised. But we are not bound by the same considerations to keep the Turks *in*. On the contrary, it is the weakness of the Turks which alone makes the Russians formidable; and though the Ottoman Empire has been for ages in possession of the finest regions and the strongest positions in the world, the use it has made of those splendid territories is such that its existence has seemed for the last few months to depend on the presence of a squadron from a foggy island in the North Sea. What we desire to see is a powerful and independent State, not being Russian, in possession of those magnificent dominions, which are formed by nature for commerce, for empire, and for the happiness of mankind. But it is utterly chimerical to suppose that a nation whose presence in those regions has literally blasted the natural fertility of the soil, and which is debarred from all real change or improvement by the fundamental obligations of its religion and its laws, can become such a State. Turkey has been kept alive by the injection of Christian blood, but her own life-spring is already cold. The last quality she retains is that dogged valour and enthusiastic contempt for life which has never yet failed her soldiers in presence of an enemy.

It will be inferred from the opinions we have expressed on the present condition of the Ottoman Empire, which are derived from the concurring testimony of all the writers and travellers who appear to us most deserving of credit, that we are not disposed to regard with much confidence the first successes of

Omar Pasha's army on the Danube, and that His Majesty Abdul Medjid appears to us to have assumed the title of 'El-Ghaji,' the Victorious, with rather too much precipitation. Omar Pasha's movements have been viewed with a good deal of superficial enthusiasm by the daily press, for although they were certainly creditable to that general and to the Turkish troops, they amount in reality to little more than an affair of outposts, in which the Turks repulsed an attack on their entrenched position at Oltenitza, covered by batteries which were quite unassailable as long as they fired across the Danube. As yet the Turks have attempted no field manœuvres in the presence of the enemy, and although, like all Orientals, they are very formidable behind an entrenched position, the result of a campaign depends on a power of movement which they are not yet shown to possess. Their chiefs, however, seem perfectly aware that the greatest danger to which they are exposed would be that of fighting a general action in an open country, where their artillery would be less effective, and the want of cavalry would be more severely felt. The gorgeous old cavalry of the Ottomans, splendid in horses and arms, skilful in the use of the scimitar, and irresistible in a charge, is totally extinct; and the attempt to substitute for it a bastard European light cavalry, armed with lances and riding with long stirrups, has failed. The cavalry is the worst part of the Turkish army; its equipments are wretched; and the men, incapable of learning our modes of equitation and exercise, can hardly keep their seats. Omar Pasha has repeatedly stated to European officers that he rests the fate of his campaign on Schumla, and there is no doubt that the position now occupied by his centre in the triangle formed by Schumla, Silistria, and Rustchuk, or by Silistria, Schumla, and Varna, is one of immense strength. Schum itself is an entrenched camp capable of receiving a large army, admirably situated, and judiciously defended by art; but it is not equally certain that it may not be turned, and the Russians will not again sit down before it, if they can do otherwise. If the issue of the war rested on military operations to be carried on by the Russians against that position and the fortified passes of the Balkan, we should be fully prepared for a protracted resistance, and very probably a failure on the part of the assailant. But there are other lines of operation open to an invading army; there is the increasing danger of insurrection amongst the Christian populations and the progressive exhaustion of the Turkish Government.

The reconquest of the Danubian principalities by the Turkish arms alone is an idle dream; and what their future condition

will be must depend on the general results of the war. To Turkey herself, since the loss of the Crimea and of Bessarabia, these principalities have been rather a burden than an advantage. She draws from them no troops, and the tribute, which was somewhat irregularly paid up, has proved a most inadequate compensation for the expense of defending them. They have imposed on the Porte all the most onerous duties of sovereignty, with no corresponding advantage to its own interests. The reason, indeed, for which they have been so long retained, seems chiefly that they were regarded as a sort of appanage by the great families of the Fanariote Greeks, who used to conduct the foreign relations of the Porte, and the first dragoman of the Porte was frequently promoted to the office of Hospodar. It was remarked long ago by Baron de Beaujour in his excellent 'Voyage Militaire dans l'Empire Ottoman,' that the possession of the principalities and the necessity of defending them was a great cause of weakness to Turkey, and that the military strength of the empire would be materially increased when drawn within limits more fitted by nature to resist invasion. The interest of Europe and the interest of Turkey herself is not that these provinces should retain their anomalous and embarrassing connexion with the Porte, but that they should *not be Russian;* and the Porte would gain far more by the interposition of an independent barrier between her dominions and the Russian frontier than by the maintenance of a profitless supremacy which cannot be defended against Russian attack. It would be highly desirable that these provinces should, for their own sake, and for that of their neighbours, obtain a more definite political constitution under the protection of the public law of Europe; for however little they may fall within the grasp of Turkey, we assume it to be clear that Russia will not be suffered to annex those provinces to her empire, if the rest of Europe can prevent it. They are already the granary from which a large proportion of the corn imported and consumed by the more densely peopled states of Western Europe is obtained. Nothing can exceed the productive power of the soil, but such is the want of roads that the transport of a load of wheat from the neighbourhood of Bucharest to the nearest port on the Danube, a distance of some fifty miles, costs as much as its freight to England. Moreover, these unhappy countries have scarcely ever enjoyed ten consecutive years of tranquillity, but have perpetually suffered all the hardships of war from Russian occupations, forced contributions, and Turkish retaliation. The protection Russia affects to have secured to them consists in little more than in making them the scene of her encroach-

ments; and the result of the present struggle will probably decide whether they are to be permanently annexed to her empire, or whether they are to be effectually preserved from these attacks.

The question which the Emperor Nicholas has unadvisedly raised no longer lies between himself and Turkey; for since he rests his claims on the necessity of protecting the Christian subjects of the Porte, that is a right and a duty in which other Christian Powers concede no precedency to Russia. There is, however, this important difference, that we think ourselves entitled to require that Christians shall be protected *by* the Porte, under whose government they are born; Russia has attempted to protect them *against* the Porte, which is their sovereign. Hitherto it is deserving of observation, as a fact creditable to the Turkish Government, that in the course of the preparations for this war, and even amidst the excitement of actual hostilities, comparatively few acts of intolerance or brutality have been committed, and where they have occurred they have been instantly repressed and punished by the civil and military authorities. The Turks have learned by experience, and in some degree, perhaps, from a greater spirit of tolerance, that the consequences of exciting religious warfare are eminently dangerous; and the Porte is perfectly aware that the first outbreak of Moslem fanaticism would be answered by an explosion of Christian enthusiasm from European races amounting to thrice the number of its Mahomedan subjects. It is a mistake into which we are surprised to find that so acute an observer of Eastern life as Mr. Layard should have fallen, to suppose that the Christians are prepared to afford any practical support to the Turkish Government. The language of addresses from the Patriarch of Constantinople and certain Greek houses has been cited in support of this opinion; but a nearer examination of the facts would show that these demonstrations have been got up for effect, and that they are parts of the system by which the reforming Turkish statesmen hope to retain their hold on Europe. The choice of the Patriarch Anthimos, which took place this autumn on the death of his predecessor, was dictated by motives of political influence, in which the feelings of the leading Greeks, even of the capital, were not consulted; for in all the perplexing combinations of Turkish politics there seems to be an under current of far greater force than the movement on the surface, flowing in the opposite direction. Beneath the attempts at reform lie all the symptoms of decay,—beneath the pretence of enlightened patriotism lies scandalous corruption,—beneath the avowed principles of toleration lie the elements of a religious struggle. An approximation

between Turkish rulers and Greek subjects is as probable as a hearty reconciliation between the Orangemen and Roman Catholics of Ireland, to whose relative condition the Ottoman Empire in Europe offers some analogy. A brave, fierce, and intolerant minority maintained for centuries their sway partly by their own prowess, partly by exclusive laws, and partly by the support of a neighbouring country, which was pledged to perpetuate their dominion. That state of things has resisted, even to the present time in Ireland, the influence of education, of justice, and of freedom: what must it still be in Turkey, where those three conditions of social progress are all equally unknown?

We purposely abstain, on the present occasion, from any attempt to discuss the political conduct of the other governments of Europe which have interposed in this complicated question, because the materials on which a correct judgment can be formed are not before the public, and because the position of affairs in the East is still too uncertain for us either to congratulate our readers on the preservation of peace, or to prepare them for the hazards and sacrifices of war. At the present moment little could be added to the facts which are known by the daily press, and probably before these lines are published some fresh and more decisive change will have occurred in the current of events. The cannon of Sinope has shattered and sunk the protocols of Vienna as well as the Turkish frigates, and the time for more active measures on the part of the Maritime Powers has indubitably arrived. At present, however, we can only discuss the main principles which have throughout these negotiations formed the basis of the policy of Europe, and which even the perils of impending war have not yet destroyed. Never was the desire of peace more universal, or the determination to avoid all unnecessary changes in Europe more complete; and it cannot but be remarked as a circumstance of great and unlooked-for good fortune, that in such an emergency the Ruler of France should have thrown the whole influence of his government on the side of public tranquillity and public law. This pacific policy had, in the first place, the effect of uniting the cabinets of Great Britain and France; and secondly, though by slower steps, it obtained the entire and active concurrence of the German Powers, and consolidated a more complete union between the four principal courts of Europe. That point could only be attained by extreme patience and moderation; for if the Maritime Powers had assumed a more belligerent attitude at first, instead of remaining in the position of mediators, they ran great risk of throwing Austria and Prussia on the

side of the antagonist of the Ottoman Empire. As long as this union is preserved, it may be hoped that no events of a permanently disastrous character will occur. War itself cannot be long maintained by one Power against the rest of the world, and the dangers of such a struggle are not so much in the East as in the division and the jealousies of the West. The fate of the Ottoman Empire as a Mussulman Power will not be permanently averted or long delayed by any arrangements to which the present crisis may give rise, but there will be less reason to look with apprehension or distrust on the future revolutions of the East, as long as the great Powers of Central Europe persevere in the united policy they have hitherto pursued. If, on the other hand, the influence of Russia should be such as to detach either the Austrian or Prussian Governments from the alliance which is the last hope of peace, the war would indeed assume a general character, and would probably not end until it had produced very important changes in the political condition of Europe.

Whatever may be the artifices of diplomacy or the vicissitudes of war, it is certain that henceforth Europe has bound herself to an active interference in the affairs of the Turkish Empire, until they are placed upon a more secure and lasting foundation. The duties of this undesirable position may be onerous and embarrassing, but it is too late to recede from them, and every step we have already taken binds us more closely to fulfil them. From the moment that the territorial integrity of the Turkish Empire could only be defended by the support of foreign Powers, its independence was at an end, for independence which rests on foreign succour is a contradiction in terms; and in exactly the same proportion in which we contribute to uphold Turkish authority we are bound to direct that authority to humane and liberal objects. What the reconstruction of the Eastern Empire by Russia would be may be inferred from the condition of her own dominions, and from the extraordinary acts of falsehood and violence which have marked her conduct in this transaction. May we rather aspire, in common with the most enlightened states of Western Europe, to effect the regeneration of the Ottoman Empire, or by whatever other name the Empire of the East may be called, on no principle of selfish advantage; and may it not be a hopeless or impracticable task gradually to restore those magnificent territories, by the joint influence of Europe, to civil freedom and to Christian laws.

That this regeneration may be effected by pacific measures, and with the concurrence of all the great European Powers,

Russia not excepted, is our devout wish. Since the unjust and unprovoked aggression of Russia upon Turkey, all means which negotiation could afford for settling the dispute between the two countries have been exhausted. Every effort has, we believe, been made, in perfect sincerity and good faith, by the Government of Her Majesty, first, for averting war between Russia and Turkey, and, subsequently, for confining hostilities to those two countries, and for bringing about a satisfactory adjustment of differences, without a recourse to arms on the part of the other European Powers. If, however, violent counsels should continue to prevail at St. Petersburg, and if the Emperor should persist in the career of aggression upon which he has blindly entered, we trust that England may not arm in vain. If she engages in a Russian war, her past conduct evinces conclusively that she engages in it with reluctance. Such a war will not be undertaken with ambitious views, for purposes of territorial aggrandisement, or in order to add to the naval triumphs of Britain. Still less will it be undertaken for a mere sentiment; however warmly every manly heart must sympathise with a feeble nation attacked by a constantly encroaching and unscrupulous neighbour. If England should unhappily find herself involved in hostilities with the Russian Empire, the war must be made for sustaining the solid interests of our own country: it must be made for preserving the equilibrium of Europe, and for guarding against a dangerous extension of the European dominions of Russia. It must be made in order to prevent Russia from enlarging that protectorate which she already exercises over Germany; from converting Constantinople into a new centre of conquest, in which commanding position her arms would soon be stretched from the Rhine and the Danube to the Indus; from founding, by gradual aggression, a universal monarchy more extensive and more easily held in subjection than that of Napoleon. England will not stand alone in the contest; and it must be borne in mind, that a war between such Powers as France and England on the one hand, and Russia on the other, cannot be a petty war; that gigantic forces must be set in motion; and that a chain of causes, of which no man can see the last link, must be forged. Every Minister of the Crown who advises, and every Member of Parliament who votes for, a war with Russia, must, if he understands the true interest of England, be prepared to make the utmost exertions, to strike the hardest blow, and to inflict the deepest wound which the vast resources of this country will permit.

## NOTE TO ART. I.

Since our First Article was printed, we have (chiefly through the kindness of Alexander Oswald, Esq., of Auchincruive), obtained some additional information respecting Mr. Richard Oswald, which we annex in a note, as there is no account of him in any of the ordinary books of reference.

Richard Oswald, of Auchincruive, in the county of Ayr, (probably born about 1710,) was a younger son of the Rev. George Oswald, minister of Dunnet, in Caithness. He was for many years a merchant in the City of London, and (through his wife, Mary Ramsay,) was owner of considerable estates both in the West Indies and on the continent of America. During the Seven Years' War, he took extensive Government contracts, and not being satisfied with the manner in which his agents in Germany performed their duties, he went to Germany himself, and acted for several campaigns as Commissary-General of the allied forces under the Duke of Brunswick. In 1759, he purchased the estate of Auchincruive, and other estates in Ayrshire. On account of his connexion with America, he was often consulted by the Government during the American war. He died at Auchincruive, Nov. 4. 1784, without issue. His acquaintance with Lord Shelburne, which led to his being employed as a negotiator in 1782, originated in a letter of introduction from Adam Smith.

We have been favoured by Mr. Alexander Oswald with a copy of a Diary kept by Richard Oswald of his two journeys to Paris in 1782, as well as of a journey in September of a previous year (apparently on some private business of his own), in which, however, he had an interview with Franklin, and also with the Comte de Vergennes. The entries in this Diary are very brief. Franklin arrived in France in Dec. 1776, and as Oswald's first visit was before 1782, and in a year in which the 7th and 14th of September fell on a Sunday, it must have been in the year 1777. It is, however, remarkable that Franklin in his 'Journal,' (Works, vol. ix. p. 240.) speaks of Oswald as if he had seen him for the first time in April, 1782; he says that Oswald was then introduced to him by 'an old friend and near neighbour of 'mine many years in London:' Oswald also brought a letter of introduction from Mr. Laurens, as well as the letter from Lord Shelburne; nevertheless, Oswald describes himself as reminding Franklin of this first visit in an interview which probably took place before the 'Journal' was composed.

Subjoined to this Diary are full minutes of Oswald's conversations with Franklin on the 31st of May and 3rd June, 1782; between which days he states that he had an interview with Mr. Grenville. We regret that the length of the minutes prevents us from printing them entire: we therefore subjoin extracts of those portions which bear principally upon the question discussed in our Article.

1782. 'Arrived at Paris, Friday, 31st May, nine in the 'morning. Called on Mr. Grenville; delivered his packets. 'Then went out to Passy, and delivered to Dr. Franklin the 'sundry letters for him, and had a good deal of conversation 'with him about the affairs of the peace. He thought there 'should be separate commissions to treat, one for France, one 'for the Colonies. Was not so positive as to Spain and 'Holland, although mentioned on several occasions. That 'though the treaties might go on separately, yet to be united in 'the final conclusion; meaning that there should be such corre-'spondence between them that there should be no separate con-'clusion. That by treating separately, different interests and 'subjects not strictly relative to each other, would not be mixed 'and involved in too much intricacy, and so might be separately 'discussed in the progress, and yet the final conclusion of the 'whole in one general settlement might be governed and made 'to be dependent upon those separate adjustments. Adding 'that the more we favoured them (meaning the Colonies) the 'more they would do for us in the conclusion of these separate 'treaties.'

June 3rd. 'I wanted to take my leave, having sat a con-'siderable time, but he wished me to stay a little longer. And 'he fell into the subject formerly mentioned of the treaty going 'on by separate commissions for each party, and said he 'could see no objection to there being one commission for 'France, one for the Colonies, and perhaps one for Spain and 'one for Holland. That by this means, the business with each 'being separately discussed, they might more quickly and 'clearly come to a conclusion than when so many different 'interests must be jointly treated under the same commis-'sion. That, with respect to the Colony business, if my 'private affairs would allow of my absence, and that I would 'divert myself in the mean time, I might take up that com-'mission. I told him, that if it was to trench on the character 'of Mr. Grenville's station, it would be the last thing I should 'incline to. That I believed him very capable and prudent, 'and had no doubt of his acquiring himself a reputation. As 'to my stay here, it was on account of various circumstances

'not the most agreeable. And with respect to my private 'affairs, they were in such situation that I should not suffer 'much by my attendance. At least, I should make no account 'of these matters if I thought that upon so critical an occasion 'I would be of any service to my country, &c.

'The doctor replied, that he thought the Commission for the 'Colonies would be better in my hands than in Mr. Grenville's. 'That I understood more of Colony business than he did, and 'he himself had a longer acquaintance with me than with Mr. 'Grenville, and could not say but he esteemed me; and there- 'fore not only thought the Colony Commission would be left in 'my hands, but he wished it might be so.

'I replied, that his wishing it was enough to determine, if I 'found it was a task I could go through with. That my 'coming here after the first time was entirely owing to the 'letters he wrote to Lord Shelburne, wherein he was pleased to 'express himself so favourably with respect to me, that I was 'ordered to return on the two succeeding occasions. That I 'was happy in the enjoyment of his good opinion. Was much 'obliged to him, &c.

'From thence we turned to a more general course of con- 'versation, when I told him I could not but contratulate 'him in his present happy situation. Since I considered the 'settlement of a peace on fair and equitable terms to be 'entirely in his hands. Since, to speak the truth, I could not 'help thinking, that when they as Commissioners of the Colo- 'nies were satisfied they had it in their power to draw the line 'of such reasonable termination as ought and must content the 'other Powers.'

Mr. Oswald's record of the latter part of the conversation on the 3rd of June agrees substantially with Franklin's account of it in his Journal, although the latter is more concise. (Works, ib. p. 316.) Both the conversations, as preserved by Oswald in his private notes, negative the idea that there was any disposition on his part to counteract Mr. Grenville, although they show that Franklin preferred negotiating with Mr. Oswald.

---

*No. CCII. will be published in April.*

THE

# EDINBURGH REVIEW,

APRIL, 1854.

## No. CCII.

ART. I.—1. **Patriarchal Order, or Plurality of Wives.* By ORSON SPENCER, Chancellor of the University of Deseret. Liverpool: 1853.

2. *The Seer.* Edited by ORSON PRATT. vol. 1. From January 1853 to December 1853. Washington: 1853.

3. *Reports of the Scandinavian, Italian, and Prussian Missions of the Latter Day Saints.* Liverpool: 1853.

4. *Millennial Star* [the Weekly Organ of Mormonism], *vols. XIV. and XV., from January* 1852 *to December* 1853. Liverpool: 1852 and 1853.

5. *History of the Mormons.* By Lieutenant GUNNISON. Philadelphia: 1852.

6. *Survey of Utah.* By Captain STANSBURY. Philadelphia: 1852.

7. *The Mormons. Illustrated by Forty Engravings.* London: 1852.

8. *Letters on the Doctrines.* By O. SPENCER. London: 1852.

---

* To save time and space we shall refer to these works as follows: to (1.) as *P. O.*; (2.) as *Seer;* to (4.) as *XIV.* or *XV.;* to (5.) as *G.;* to (6.) as *S.;* to (7.) as *M. Illust.;* to (8.) as *Spencer;* to (9.) as *Hymns;* to (10.) as *Kane;* to (13.) as *D. C.;* and to (14.) as *Mormon.*

9. *Hymns of Latter Day Saints.* London: 1851.
10. *The Mormons.* By THOMAS KANE. Philadelphia: 1850.
11. *A Bill to establish a Territorial Government for Utah.* Washington: 1850.
12. *Exposé of Mormonism.* By JOHN BENNETT. Boston: 1842.
13. *Doctrines and Covenants of Latter Day Saints.* Nauvoo: 1846.
14. *The Book of Mormon.* Palmyra. 1830.

THE readers of Southey's 'Doctor' must remember the quaint passage in which he affects to predict that his book will become the Scripture of a future Faith; that it will be 'dug up 'among the ruins of London, and considered as one of the 'sacred books of the sacred island of the West; and give birth 'to a new religion, called *Dovery*, or *Danielism*, which may 'have its chapels, churches, cathedrals, abbeys; its synods, 'consistories, convocations, and councils; its acolytes, sacristans, 'deacons, priests, prebendaries, canons, deans, bishops, arch-'bishops, cardinals, and popes. . . . . Its *High-Dovers* and '*Low-Dovers*, its *Danielites* of a thousand unimagined and un-'imaginable denominations; its schisms, heresies, seditions, 'persecutions, and wars.' Many must have felt, when they read this grotesque extravaganza, that it almost overstepped the boundary which separates fun from nonsense. Yet its wild imagination has been more than realised by recent facts. While Southey was writing it at Keswick, a manuscript was lying neglected on the dusty shelves of a farmhouse in New England, which was fated to attain more than the honours which he playfully imagines as the future portion of his 'Daniel Dove.'

The book destined to so singular an apotheosis, was the production of one Solomon Spalding, a Presbyterian preacher in America; of whose history we only know that, like so many others of his class and country, he had abandoned theology for trade, and had subsequently failed in business. Nor can we wonder, judging from the only extant specimen of his talents, that he should have been thus unfortunate both in the pulpit and at the counter. After his double failure the luckless man, who imagined (according to his widow's statement) that he had 'a literary taste,' thought to redeem his shattered fortunes by the composition of an historical romance. The subject which he chose was the history of the North American Indians; and the work which he produced was a chronicle of their wars and migrations. They were described as descendants of the pa-

triarch Joseph, and their fortunes were traced for upwards of a thousand years, from the reign of Zedekiah, king of Judah, down to the fifth century of the Christian era. This narrative purported to be a record buried in the earth by Mormon, its last compiler, and was entitled 'The Manuscript Found.' A manuscript, indeed, it seemed likely to remain. Its author vainly endeavoured to persuade the booksellers to undertake the risk of its publication. Nor does their refusal surprise us; for we do not remember, among all the ponderous folios which human dulness has produced, any other book of such unmitigated stupidity. It seems inconceivable how any man could patiently sit down, day after day, to weary himself with writing sheet after sheet of such sleep-compelling nonsense. Its length is interminable, amounting to above five hundred closely printed octavo pages. Yet, from the first to the last, though professing to be composed by different authors, under various circumstances, during a period of a thousand years, it is perfectly uniform in style, and maintains the dryness without the brevity of a chronological table. Not a spark of imagination or invention enlivens the weary sameness of the annalist; no incidental pictures of life or manners give colour or relief to the narrative. The only thing which breaks the prosaic monotony is the insertion of occasional passages from Scripture; and these are so clumsily brought in, that they would seem purposely introduced to show by contrast the worthlessness of the foil in which they are embedded. Nor is dulness the only literary offence committed by the writer of the book of Mormon. It is impossible to read three pages of it without stumbling on some gross violation of grammar, such as the following: — 'O ye wicked *ones*, 'hide *thee* in the dust.' 'It all *were* vain.' 'We had *somewhat* 'contentions.' 'I should have *wore* these bands.' 'Why per-'secuteth *thou* the Church.' 'He has *fell*.' 'The promises 'hath been.' 'Our sufferings *doth* exceed.' 'All things which 'is expedient.' These blunders are so uniformly interspersed throughout the work, that they must be ascribed to its author, and not (as they have sometimes* been) to a subsequent interpolator. Yet this worthless book, which its writer could not even get printed in his lifetime, is now stereotyped in the

* This hypothesis has been resorted to because people cannot understand how an educated teacher of religion should be capable of such blunders. But in America the literary qualifications for ordination are necessarily reduced to a minimum. In our researches among the Mormonite authors, we have found several examples of *ci-devant* 'Ministers,' who not merely write bad grammar, but cannot even spell correctly.

chief languages of Europe, and is regarded by proselytes in every quarter of the globe as a revelation from heaven.

This extraordinary change of fortune was brought about by the successful roguery of a young American named Joseph Smith, the son of a small farmer in Vermont. From an early age this youth had amused himself by practising on the credulity of his simpler neighbours. When he was a boy of fourteen, there occurred in the town of Palmyra, where he then lived, one of those periods of religious excitement which are called in America *Revivals*. The fervour and enthusiasm which attends these occurrences often produces good effects. Many excellent men have traced the sincere piety which has distinguished them through life, to such an origin. But there is a danger that the genuine enthusiasm of some should provoke hypocrisy in others. So it happened on this occasion in Palmyra. Half the inhabitants were absorbed in the most animated discussion of their deepest religious feelings. Any extraordinary 'experience' was sure to attract the eagerest interest. Under these circumstances, young Joseph amused himself by falling in with the prevailing current, and fixing the attention of his pious friends upon himself, by an 'experience' more wonderful than any of theirs. He gave out that while engaged in fervent prayer, he had been favoured with a miraculous vision. 'I saw,' says he, 'a pillar of light above the brightness of the sun, which de-'scended gradually upon me. It no sooner appeared, than I 'found myself delivered from the enemy which held me bound. 'When the light rested upon me, I saw two personages whose 'brightness and glory defy all description, standing above me 'in the air.' He goes on in his 'Autobiography' (from which we quote) to say that these heavenly messengers declared all existing Christian sects in error, and forbade him to join any of them. This statement, however, was no doubt an afterthought. At the time, he probably only proclaimed that his 'deliverance 'from the enemy' had been effected by a supernatural appearance.

Such precocious hypocrisy, however painful, is no extraordinary phenomenon. Probably every outburst of kindred excitement developes some similar instance of childish imposture. Examples will occur to those who are familiar with the early history of Methodism. And we remember lately to have seen a narrative published by a believer in the 'Irvingite' miracles, detailing a case where a boy of only seven years old pretended to inspiration, and kept up the farce for many weeks, duping all the while his infatuated parents, and having the impudence seriously to rebuke his old grandfather for unbelief.

Children are flattered by the notice which they excite by such pretensions; and, if the credulity of their elders gives them encouragement, are easily tempted to go on from lie to lie. For there is perhaps no period of life more sensible than childhood to the delights of notoriety.

It was, probably, only a desire for this kind of distinction which originally led Joseph Smith to invent his vision. At first, however, he did not meet with the success which he expected. On the contrary, he complains that the story 'had 'excited a great deal of prejudice against him among professors 'of religion,' and that it drew 'persecution' upon him. We may suppose that his character for mendacity was already so well known in his own neighbourhood as to discredit his assertions. At all events, he seems thenceforward to have laid aside, till a later period, the part of a religious impostor, and to have betaken himself to less impious methods of cheating. For some years he led a vagabond life, about which little is known, except that he was called 'Joe Smith the Money-digger,' and that he swindled several simpletons by his pretended skill in the use of the divining-rod. In short, he was a Yankee *Dousterswivel*. Among the shrewd New-Englanders one would have thought such pretensions unlikely to be profitable. But it seems there were legends current of the buried wealth of buccaneers, and Dutch farmers possessing the requisite amount of gullibility; and on this capital our hero traded.

His gains, however, were but small; and he was struggling with poverty, when at last he lighted on a vein of genuine metal, which, during the remainder of his life, he continued to work with ever-growing profit. This was no other than the rejected and forgotten manuscript of poor Solomon Spalding, which had either been purloined by Smith's associate, Sidney Rigdon (who had been employed in a printing office where it was once deposited), or had been stolen out of the trunk of Mrs. Spalding, who lived about this time in the neighbourhood of Smith's father. In one way or another, it fell into Joseph's hands about twelve years after its author's death. The manuscript, as we have said, purported to have been buried by Mormon, its original compiler.* This easily suggested to the imagination of Smith, already full of treasure-trove, the notion

* The proofs that the 'Book of Mormon,' published by Smith, is identical with Spalding's 'Manuscript Found,' are conclusive. The identity is asserted in the depositions of Spalding's widow, of Spalding's brother, and of Spalding's partner, Henry Lake, the two latter of whom swear to their acquaintance with Spalding's manuscript. (See *Bennett*, 115.)

of pretending that he had dug it up. At first, however, he seems to have intended nothing more than to hoax the members of his own family. He told them that an angel had revealed to him a bundle of golden plates, engraved with mysterious characters, but had forbidden him to show them to others. His hearers (to his surprise, apparently,) seemed inclined to believe his story; and he remarked to a neighbour (whose deposition is published), that he 'had fixed the fools, and would have some 'fun.' But it soon occurred to him that his fabrication might furnish what he valued more than 'fun.' He improved upon his first story of the discovery, by adding, that the angel had also shown him, together with the plates, 'two stones in silver 'bows, fastened to a breast-plate, which constituted what is 'called the *Urim and Thummim*. . . . . The possession and 'use of which constituted *Seers* in ancient times, and God had 'prepared them for the purpose of translating the book.' (*Smith's Autobiography, XIV.*) Furnished with this mysterious apparatus, he was commanded to translate and publish these divine records. He might reasonably expect that the publication of Spalding's Manuscript, garnished with this miraculous story, would prove a profitable speculation: just as the unsaleable reams of 'Drelincourt on Death' were transmuted into a lucrative copyright by the ghost-story of De Foe. On the strength of these expectations, he obtained advances of money from a farmer named Martin Harris.* Concerning this man, as concerning most of the early associates of Smith, we must remain in doubt whether he were a dupe or an accomplice. His cupidity was interested in the success of the 'Book of 'Mormon,' and therefore he may be suspected of deceit. On the other hand, he did not reap the profit he expected from the publication, which, as a bookselling speculation, was at first unsuccessful; and he was ruined by the advances he had made. Ultimately, he renounced his faith (real or pretended) in Joseph, who, in revenge, abused him in the newspapers as 'a white-'skinned negro,' and a 'lackey.' (*M. Illust.* 34.) This looks as if he had been a dupe, and not in possession of any dangerous

* 'Our translation drawing to a close,' says Smith, 'we went to 'Palmyra, *secured the copyright*, and agreed with Mr. Grandon to 'print 5000 copies for the sum of 3000 dollars.' (*Autob. XIV.*) This sum was supplied by Harris, in accordance with a 'revelation' delivered in March, 1830, as follows:—'I command thee that thou 'shalt not covet thine own property, but impart it freely to the print-'ing of the "Book of Mormon." . . . . Impart a portion of thy 'property, yea, even part of thy lands . . . . Pay the debt thou 'hast contracted with the printer.' (*D. C.* sec. 44.)

secrets. It is certain that he consulted Professor Anthon at New York on the subject of the mysterious plates; and that he showed the Professor a specimen of the engravings, which Mr. Anthon describes as 'evidently prepared by some one who had 'before him a book containing various alphabets, Greek and 'Hebrew letters, &c.; the whole ending in a rude delineation 'of a circle decked with strange marks, and evidently copied 'after the Mexican Calendar given by Humboldt.'* Harris also stated his intention of selling his farm, to provide funds for the translation and publication of these plates. The Professor vainly remonstrated, regarding him as the victim of roguery. Not long after, early in 1830, the Book of Mormon was published, and Harris was employed in hawking it about for sale. He also signed a certificate, which is prefixed to the book, wherein he joins with two other witnesses in testifying the authenticity of the revelation, as follows: —

'We declare with words of soberness, that an angel of God came down from heaven, and he brought and laid before our eyes [*sic*] that we beheld and saw the plates and the engravings thereon.'

Eight other witnesses also testify that they had seen the plates, but without the angel. If we are not to consider all these as accomplices in the fraud, we must suppose that Smith had got some brass plates made, and had scratched them over with figures. No one else was allowed to see them; and Joseph informs us, that after he had 'accomplished by them what was 'required at his hand,' . . . . '*according to arrangements, the 'messenger called for them, and he* [*the angel*] *has them in his 'charge until this day.*' (*Autob. XIV.*)

Although the sale of the 'Book of Mormon' did not originally repay the cost of publication, yet it made a few converts. It was very soon 'revealed' that these proselytes were bound to consecrate their property to the support of Joseph. Thus we find in a revelation of February, 1831: — 'It is meet that my 'servant, Joseph Smith, Junior, should have a house built in 'which to live and translate.' (*D. C.* sec. 13.) And again: — 'If ye desire the mysteries of my kingdom, provide for him 'food and raiment, and whatsoever thing he needeth.' (*D. C.* sec. 14.) And his love for idleness was gratified by a revelation which commanded it: — 'In temporal labours thou shalt 'not have strength, for that is not thy calling.' (*D. C.* sec. 9.) A singular announcement to be made by a prophet who soon after became the manager of a Bank, partner in a commercial

* Mr. Anthon's letter to Mr. Howe, Feb. 17. 1834.

house, Mayor of Nauvoo, General of Militia, and a candidate for the Presidency of the United States.

We see, however, from these revelations (which were all given within twelve months from the publication of the book) that the imposture had already expanded beyond its original dimensions in the mind of its author. At first, he only claims to have miraculously discovered a sacred record, but does not himself pretend to inspiration. Soon, however, he proclaims that he is a prophet divinely commissioned to introduce a new dispensation of religion. And in April, 1830, he receives a revelation establishing him in that character, and commanding the 'Church' to 'give heed unto all his words and commandments.' (*D. C.* sec. 46.) At the same time, it is announced that all existing sects are in sinful error; and their members are required to seek admittance by baptism into the new church of Joseph Smith. In accordance with this revelation, he proceeded to 'organise the Church of *Latter Day Saints.*' He and his earliest accomplice, Cowdery, baptized one another; and in the course of the month they baptized twenty or thirty other persons, including Smith's father and two brothers, who, from the first, took a profitable share in the imposture.

In the same year, the new sect was openly joined by one of its most important members, Sidney Rigdon, who had perhaps been previously leagued with Smith in secret.* This man had been successively a printer and a preacher; and in the latter capacity, he had belonged to several denominations. It is but too evident, from the impure practices of which he was afterwards convicted at Nauvoo, that he was influenced by none but the most sordid motives in allying himself to the Mormonites. He was one of those adventurers, not uncommon in America, who are preachers this year and publicans the next, hiring alternately a tabernacle or a tavern. In point of education, however, Rigdon, though far from learned, was superior to his vulgar and ignorant associates. It was therefore revealed that he should take the literary business of the new partnership. (*D. C.* sec. 11.) Accordingly, the earlier portion of the 'Doctrines and Covenants' (the Mormonite New Testament) was composed by him; and he thus became the theological founder of the sect, so far as it had at that time any distinctive creed. For the 'Book of Mormon' itself contains no novel dogmas, nor any statements which would be considered heretical by the majority of Protestants, except the condemnation of infant

* *I. e.* if we suppose that Rigdon was the person who had conveyed Spalding's MS. to Smith.

baptism, and the assertion of the perpetuity of miraculous gifts.* Smith had apparently left the work of Spalding unaltered, except by interpolating a few words on this latter subject, which were necessary to support his own supernatural stories. But Rigdon encouraged him to take a bolder flight. He announced the materialistic doctrines which have since been characteristic of the Sect; he departed from the orthodox Trinitarianism which had been adopted in the 'Book of Mormon;'† and to him may be probably attributed the introduction of baptism for the dead. Moreover, under his influence the constitution of the Mormonite Church was remodelled. Joseph had begun by adopting the ordinary Presbyterian divisions; but now a more complex organisation was introduced, and it was revealed that the true Church must necessarily possess all those officers who existed in the primitive epoch — Apostles, Prophets, Patriarchs, Evangelists, Elders, Deacons, Pastors, Teachers; besides a twofold hierarchy of Priests, called by the respective names of Aaron and of Melchisedek. The object of this change was to give an official position to every active and serviceable adherent, and to establish a compact subordination throughout the whole body; an object in which no religious society except that of the Jesuits has more completely succeeded.

While rendering such services to his new associates, Rigdon did not neglect his private interests. He immediately obtained the second place in rank; and after a short time he compelled his accomplice to receive a revelation which raised him to equality with the Prophet. (*D. C.* sec. 85.) He was thus enabled to claim his fair share in the spoil of dupes whom he so largely contributed to deceive.

Under these new auspices the Sect made rapid progress. But while Joseph continued in the district where his youth was spent, there were many stumbling-blocks in his path. The indignation of his neighbours was naturally roused by the successful frauds of a man whom they had despised as a cheat and liar from his cradle. He vainly endeavoured to disarm such feelings, by candidly avowing his past iniquities; those who had known him from boyhood were not easily persuaded to be-

* It is a curious fact that the English *Irvingites*, who also hold the latter doctrine, sent a deputation with a letter, not long after the publication of the 'Book of Mormon,' to express their sympathy with Joseph Smith. The letter professes to emanate from 'a Council of 'Pastors.' (*XV.* 260.)

† 'Q. How many personages are there in the Godhead?—*Ans.* 'Two.' (*D. C.* p. 47.)

lieve in his repentance. And since, in America, there is but a short step from popular anger to popular violence, it was his obvious policy to withdraw before the storm should burst. Rigdon had already made numerous converts in Kirtland, a town of Ohio; and a nucleus was thus formed to which new proselytes might be gathered in sufficient numbers to defend their master and themselves. Hither, therefore, Joseph removed, early in 1831. But though Kirtland was for some years the centre of his operations, yet he never intended to make it his permanent abode. He already perceived, that to avail himself fully of the advantages of his position, he must assemble his disciples in a commonwealth of their own, where no unbeliever should intrude to dispute his supremacy. This was impossible in the older States of the Union, but it appeared quite practicable on the Western frontier. There land could be bought for next to nothing, in a territory almost uninhabited; and it might be reasonably presumed that a few thousand converts once established, and constantly reinforced by the influx of new proselytes, might maintain themselves against any attack which was likely to be made upon them. Acting on these views, Smith and Rigdon, after a tour of inspection, selected a site on the borders of the wilderness, which was recommended by richness of soil and facilities of water carriage. Joseph immediately put forth a string of revelations, which declared that 'Zion' was in Jackson County, Missouri, and commanded all the 'Saints' to purchase land at the sacred spot, and hasten to take possession of their inheritance. (*D. C.* sec. 66. to sec. 73.)

Within a few months no less than twelve hundred had obeyed the call, and employed themselves with all the energy of American backwoodsmen in cultivating the soil of the new Jerusalem. These converts were mostly from the Eastern States, and seem to have been, in habits and character, superior to the common run of squatters. Colonel Kane, who visited them at a later period, contrasts them favourably as 'persons of refined 'and cleanly habits and decent language' with the other 'border 'inhabitants of Missouri—the vile scum which our society, like 'the great ocean, washes upon its frontier shores.' They seem to have consisted principally of small farmers, together with such tradesmen and mechanics as are required by an agricultural colony. Nor were they without considerable shrewdness and intelligence in secular matters, however inconsistent we may think their credulity with common sense. By their axes and their ploughs, the forest soon was turned into a fruitful field; their meadows were filled with kine, and their barns with

sheaves. Unfortunately for themselves, they did not unite prudence with their industry. They were too enthusiastically certain of their triumph, to temporise or conciliate. Their prophet had declared that Zion should be established, and should put down her enemies under her feet. Why, then, should they hesitate to proclaim their anticipations? They boasted openly that they should soon possess the whole country, and that the unbelievers should be rooted out from the land. These boasts excited the greatest indignation, not unaccompanied by some fear; for the old settlers saw the number of their new neighbours increasing weekly, and knew that their compact organisation gave them a power more than proportionate to their numerical strength. Legally, however, there were no means of preventing these strangers from accomplishing their intentions. For every citizen of the Union had an undoubted right to buy land in Jackson County, and to believe that Joseph Smith, Junior, was a prophet. But in America, when the members of a local majority have made up their minds that a certain course is agreeable to their interests or their passions, the fact that it is illegal seldom prevents its adoption. The Jacksonians knew that they had at present a majority over the Mormonites, and they resolved to avail themselves of this advantage before it was too late, lest, in their turn, they should be outnumbered, and thereby be liable to those pains and penalties which are the portion of a minority in the Great Republic. The citizens of the county therefore convened a public meeting, wherein they agreed upon the following (among other) resolutions: —

'*That* no Mormon shall in future move and settle in this country.

'*That* those now here who shall give a pledge within a reasonable time to remove out of the country, shall be allowed to remain unmolested until they have sufficient time to sell their property.

'*That* the editor of 'The Star,' (the Mormon paper) be required forthwith to discontinue the business of printing in this country.

'*That* those who fail to comply with these requisitions, be referred to their brethren who have the gifts of divination and unknown tongues to inform them of the lot that awaits them.'

These resolutions were at once communicated to the Mormon leaders; but, as they did not immediately submit, the meeting unanimously resolved to raze to the ground the office of the obnoxious newspaper. This resolution was forthwith carried into effect, and the Mormon 'Bishop' (a creature of Smith's, who presided in his absence), was tarred and feathered, — an appropriate punishment enough, which had also been administered to his master, not long before, by a mob in Ohio.

Notwithstanding these hostile demonstrations, the Mormons could not bring themselves to leave their newly-purchased lands without resistance. They appealed to the legal tribunals for redress, and organised a militia, which maintained for some time a guerilla warfare against their antagonists. At length, however, they were overpowered by numbers, and abandoned their beloved Zion. But most of them found refuge in the adjoining counties, where they gradually acquired fresh property, and continued for four years in tranquillity.

Meanwhile their prophet had remained snugly established at Kirtland, which he wisely judged a more desirable home than the wild land of Zion, till the latter should be comfortably colonised by his adherents. Hence he sent out his 'apostles' and 'elders' in all directions to make proselytes, which they continued to do with great success. The first duty imposed on all converts was the payment of *tithing* to the 'Church.' (*D. C.* sec. 107.) And those who received the commands of Joseph as the voice of God, did not hesitate to furnish this conclusive proof of the reality of their faith. On the strength of the capital thus placed at his disposal, Smith established at Kirtland a mercantile house and a bank. We find from his autobiography, that the whole Smith family were at liberty to draw without stint from the common stock; and their ill-gotten gains were squandered as recklessly as might have been expected. Embarrassment ensued, and several revelations called upon the saints for money to prop the Prophet's credit.* At length the crash came. The firm failed, the bank stopped payment, and the managers were threatened with a prosecution for swindling. To escape the sheriff's writ, Smith and Rigdon were obliged to fly by night; and they took refuge among their followers in Missouri.

This occurred in the autumn of 1837, four years after the expulsion of the saints from Zion. That expulsion had painfully falsified the prophecies of Smith, who had so completely committed himself to the successful establishment of his people in the spot which he had first chosen, that he did not acquiesce in their abandonment of it without a struggle. In February, 1834, soon after their ejectment, he had promised their immediate restoration in the following revelation:—

'Verily I say unto you, I have decreed that your brethren which have been scattered shall return . . . . Behold the redemption of Zion must needs come by power. Therefore I will raise up unto my people a man who shall lead them like as Moses led the children of Israel. . . . . Verily I say unto you that my servant Baurak Ale is

* See 'Smith's Autobiography,' under date of March, 1834.

the man . . . . Therefore let my servant Baurak Ale say unto the strength of my house, my young men and the middle aged, gather yourselves together unto the land of Zion. . . . . And let all the churches send up wise men with their monies, and purchase lands as I have commanded them. And, inasmuch as mine enemies come against you, to drive you from my goodly land which I have consecrated to be the land of Zion, . . . . ye shall curse them ; and whomsoever ye curse I will curse. . . . . It is my will that my servant Parley Pratt, and my servant Lyman Wight, should not return until they have obtained companies to go up unto the land of Zion, by tens, or by twenties, or by fifties, or by an hundred, until they have obtained to the number of five hundred, of the strength of my house. Behold this is my will ; but men do not always do my will ; therefore, if you cannot obtain five hundred, seek diligently that peradventure you may obtain three hundred, and if ye cannot obtain three hundred, seek diligently that peradventure ye may obtain one hundred.' (*D. C.* sec. 101.)

By such efforts a volunteer force of 150 men had been raised, and had marched from Kirtland in June 1834, to reinstate the saints in their inheritance.* Joseph also, who, to do him justice, seems not to have lacked physical courage, had marched at their head; though why he superseded 'Baurak Ale,' the divinely-appointed Moses of the host, we are not informed. The little force had safely reached their brethren in Missouri; but the Prophet, finding they were not strong enough to effect their purpose, had disbanded them without fighting, and had himself returned to Kirtland, where he had remained till the commercial crisis which we have just mentioned.

When thus finally driven to take refuge among his followers, Smith found them in a very critical position. Four years had passed since their expulsion from Zion, and they had established themselves in greater numbers than before, in the countries bordering on that whence they had been driven. They had cultivated the soil with perseverance and success, were daily increasing in wealth, and had built two towns (or *cities,* as they called them) *Diahman* and *Far-west.* But their prudence had not grown with their prosperity. They thought themselves a match for their enemies, and fearlessly provoked them by repeating their former boasts. The Prophet's arrival added fuel to the flame. The disgraceful failure of his prophecies still rankled in his mind. He declared publicly among his disciples, that 'he would yet 'tread down his enemies, and trample on their dead bodies;' and that, 'like Mahomet, whose motto was *the Koran or the sword,* so

* See M. Star, *XV.* 69. 205.

'should it be eventually, *Joseph Smith or the sword.*'* These and similar facts were disclosed to the Missourians by apostate Mormons, and excited great exasperation. At length a collision occurred at a county election, and open warfare began. For some weeks the contest was maintained on equal terms, and both parties burnt and destroyed the property of their antagonists with no decisive result. But, finally, the Governor of Missouri called out the militia of the State, nominally, to enforce order, but really to exterminate the Mormons. They were unable to resist the overwhelming force brought against them, and surrendered almost at discretion, as appears from the following terms which they accepted: First. To deliver up their leaders for trial; secondly, To lay down their arms; thirdly, To sign over their properties, as an indemnity for the expenses of the war; and lastly, To leave the State forthwith. The spirit in which this last condition was enforced will appear from the conclusion of an address delivered to the Mormons by General Clark, the commander of the hostile forces: —

'Another thing yet remains for you to comply with — that you leave the State forthwith. Whatever your feelings concerning this affair; whatever your innocence; it is nothing to me. The orders of the governor to me were that you should be *exterminated;* and had your leader not been given up, and the treaty complied with, *before this you and your families would have been destroyed, and your houses in ashes.*'

The results of this contest seemed likely to be fatal to the Prophet, who was given up to the State authorities, to be tried on charges of treason, murder, and felony, arising out of the war. But he contrived to escape from his guards, and thus avoided, for the time, the justice of a border jury. He fled to Illinois, where he found the remnant of his persecuted proselytes, who had been compelled to cross the bleak prairies, exposed to the snowstorms of November, with no other shelter than their waggons for sick and wounded, women and children. 12,000 of these exiles crossed the Mississippi, which separates the States of Missouri and Illinois. By the citizens of the latter they were received with compassionate hospitality, and relieved with gifts of food and clothing.

In a wonderfully short time the sect displayed once more its

* The above statements are in an affidavit (given in 'Mormonism 'Illustrated') made in Oct. 1838, and countersigned by Orson Hyde, who is now the chairman of the Apostolic College. Whether he was then a renegade, who has since repented; or whether he made these confessions under compulsion, we have no information.

inherent vitality, and that strength which springs from firm union and voluntary obedience. Soon its numbers were increased by the arrival of proselytes to 15,000 souls. For the third time they gathered themselves together in a new settlement, and built the town of Nauvoo in a strong position on the banks of the Mississippi, which nearly surrounds the peninsula selected for their capital. In eighteen months the city contained 2,000 houses. The prairies were changed into corn-fields, the hills covered with flocks and herds, and steamers landed merchandise and colonists upon wharves which had superseded the aboriginal marsh. Here the Mormonites seemed at last securely established in a commonwealth of their own, and Joseph was permitted, for five years, to enjoy the rich fruits of his imposture undisturbed. The wealth at his disposal was continually increasing, both from the tithing of his old converts (which augmented with their growing property), and from the contributions of new proselytes. These were now flowing in, not only from the United States, but even from Europe. In 1837, a mission had been sent to England, and the Mormon apostles baptized 10,000 British subjects before the Prophet's death. New revelations summoned all these converts to Nauvoo, bringing with them 'their gold, their silver, and their precious stones.' (*D. C.* sec. 103.) A mansion-house was begun, where the Prophet and his family were to be lodged and maintained at the public cost. 'Let 'it be built in my name, and let my servant Joseph Smith and 'his house have place therein from generation to generation, 'saith the Lord; and let the name of the house be called the 'Nauvoo House, and let it be a delightful habitation for man.' (*D. C.* sec. 103.) But, while thus providing for his own comfort, Joseph was careful to divert the attention of his followers from his private gains by a public object of expenditure, which might seem to absorb the revenues under his charge. As he had before done at Kirtland, so now at Nauvoo he began the building of a temple. But this was to be on a far grander scale than the former edifice, and was to be consecrated by the most awful ceremonies. For here alone (so it was revealed) could the rite of baptism for the dead be efficaciously performed. (*D. C.* sec. 103.) The foundation of this temple was laid with military and civil pomp early in 1841.

Meanwhile the State of Illinois had granted a charter of incorporation to the city of Nauvoo, and Joseph Smith was elected Mayor. Moreover, the citizens capable of bearing arms were formed into a well-organised militia, to which weapons were supplied by the State. This body of troops, which was called the *Nauvoo Legion*, was perpetually drilled by the Prophet, who

had been appointed its commander, and who thenceforward adopted the style and title of 'General Smith.' On all public occasions it was his delight to appear on horseback in full uniform at the head of his little army, which consisted of about 4,000 men*, and was in a state of great efficiency. An officer who saw it reviewed in 1842, says of it, 'Its evolutions would 'do honour to any body of armed militia in the States, and ap-'proximate very closely to our regular forces.' (*M. Illust.* 115.) The 'Inspector-General' of the legion was a General Bennett, who had served in the United States army. His correspondence with Joseph is one of the most curious illustrations of the Prophet's character. Bennett offers his services in a letter wherein he avows entire disbelief in Smith's religious pretensions, but, at the same time, declares himself willing to assume the outward appearance of belief. He had gone so far as to submit to Mormon baptism, which he calls 'a glorious frolic in the clear blue 'ocean, with your worthy friend Brigham Young.'

'Nothing of this kind,' (he adds) 'would in the least attach me to your person and cause. I am capable of being a most undeviating friend, *without being governed by the smallest religious influence.* . . . I say, therefore, *go a head.* You know, Mahomet had his *right hand man.* The celebrated T. Brown, of New York, is now engaged in cutting your head on a beautiful cornelian stone, as your private seal, which will be set in gold to your order, and sent to you. . . . . Should I be compelled to announce in this quarter that I have no connection with the Nauvoo Legion, you will, of course, remain silent. . . . . I may yet run for a high office in your State, when you would be sure of my best service in your behalf. Therefore a *known* connection with you would be against our mutual interest.'

To this candid proposal Smith replied in a letter which affects to rebuke the scepticism of Bennett; but, so far was he from feeling any real indignation at the proposed partnership in imposture, that he consents to the request about the Legion, and accepts the offered bribe as follows:—

'As to the private seal you mention, if sent to me I shall receive it with the gratitude of a servant of God, and pray that the donor may receive a reward in the resurrection of the just.'

Every year now added to the wealth and population of Nauvoo, and consequently to the security of its citizens and the glory of its Mayor. Smith's head was so far turned by his success, that in 1844 he offered himself as a candidate for the Presidency of the Union. Probably, however, this proceeding was only meant as a bravado. In Nauvoo itself he reigned

* Spencer, p. 237.

supreme, and opposition was put down by the most summary proceedings. The contributions of his votaries and the zeal of their obedience, fed fat his appetite for riches and power. Nor was he restrained from the indulgence of more sensual passions, which ease and indolence had bred. In July 1843, he received a revelation authorising him, and all those whom he should license, to take an unlimited number of wives.* This document is too long to quote in full, but the manner in which it silences the remonstrances of Smith's wife is too curious to be omitted: —

'Let mine handmaid, Emma Smith, receive all those who have been given unto my servant Joseph, and who are virtuous and pure before me. . . . . Therefore it shall be lawful in me if she receive not this law, for him to receive all things whatsoever I the Lord his God will give him. . . . . And he is exempt from the law of Sarah, who administered unto Abraham according unto the law, when I commanded Abraham to take Hagar to wife.'

On this revelation Smith and his chief adherents proceeded to act. But they at first concealed the innovation under a profound mystery, and during ten years it was only communicated privately to the initiated, and its very existence continued unknown to the majority of the sect. Not many months have yet passed since the Mormon leaders have decided on a bolder policy, and have publicly avowed this portion of their system. Their present audacity, indeed, is more strange than their former reserve; considering that the consequences of the original invention of this new code of morals were fatal to the Prophet, and disastrous to the Church. For, though the revelation was concealed, the practices which it sanctioned were not easily hidden, especially when some months of impunity had given boldness to the perpetrators. Several women whom Joseph and his 'apostles' had endeavoured to seduce, declined their proposals, and disclosed them to their relatives. These circumstances roused into activity a latent spirit of resistance which had for some time been secretly gathering force. The malcontents now ventured to establish an opposition paper, called the 'Expositor'; and published, in its first number, the affidavits of sixteen women, who alleged that Smith, Rigdon, Young, and others, had invited them to enter into a secret and illicit connexion, under the title of *spiritual marriage*. This open and dangerous rebellion was put down forthwith, by the application of physical force. Joseph Smith ordered a body of his disciples to 'abate the nuisance;' and they razed the office of the 'Expositor' to the ground. The proprietors fled for their lives, and, when they reached a place

* This revelation is printed in full in 'M. Star,' *XV.* p. 5.

of safety, sued out a writ from the legal authorities of Illinois, against Joseph and Hiram Smith, as abettors of the riot. The execution of the warrant was resisted by the people and troops of Nauvoo under the Prophet's authority. On this the Governor of the State called out the militia to enforce the law, and required that the two brothers should be given up for trial. Joseph had now only the alternative of war or submission. But hostilities would have been hopeless, for his troops only amounted to 4,000 men, while the militia of the State numbered 80,000.* He therefore thought it the wiser course to surrender, especially as the Governor pledged his honour for the personal safety of the prisoners. They were accordingly committed to the county gaol at Carthage. A small body of troops was left to defend the prison, but they proved either inadequate or indisposed to the performance of their duty.

The popular mind of Illinois was at this time strongly excited against the Mormonites. The same causes which had led to their expulsion from Zion and from Missouri were again actively at work. Their rapid growth, and apparently invincible elasticity in rising under oppression, had roused even more than the former jealousy. It seemed probable that before long the influx of foreign proselytes might raise the Prophet to supremacy. Why not use the power which the circumstances of the moment placed in their hands, take summary vengeance on the impostor, and for ever defeat the ambitious schemes of his adherents? Under the influence of such hopes and passions, a body of armed men was speedily collected, who overpowered the feeble guard, burst open the doors of the gaol, and fired their rifles upon the prisoners. A ball killed Hiram on the spot; when Joseph, who was armed with a revolver, after returning two shots attempted to escape by leaping the window; but he was stunned by his fall, and, while still in a state of insensibility, was picked up and shot by the mob outside the gaol. He died on June the 27th, 1844, in the thirty-ninth year of his age.

Thus perished this profligate and sordid knave, by a death too honourable for his deserts. In England he would have been sent to the treadmill for obtaining money on false pretences. In America he was treacherously murdered without a trial; and thus our contempt for the victim is changed into horror for his executioners. The farce which he had played should not have been invested with a factitious dignity by a tragic end.

---

* Spencer, p. 236, 237. (Mr. Spencer was resident at the time in Nauvoo.)

Yet, when we consider the audacious blasphemies in which he had traded for so many years, and the awful guilt which he had incurred in making the voice of heaven pander to his own avarice and lust, we cannot deny that in his punishment, the wrath of lawless men fulfilled the righteousness of God. Secure in the devotion of his armed disciples, and at an age when he could still look forward to a long life of fraud, luxury, and ambition, he had exclaimed, 'Soul, thou hast much goods laid up 'for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry.' But the sentence had gone forth against him — 'Thou fool, this 'night thy soul shall be required of thee.'

To call such a man a martyr is an abuse of language which we regret to find in a writer so intelligent as Mr. Mayhew. A martyr is one who refuses to save his life by renouncing his faith. Joseph Smith never had such an option given him. We doubt not that if he could have escaped from the rifles of his murderers by confessing his imposture, he would have done so without hesitation; and would the next day have received a revelation, directing the faithful to seek safety in recantation when threatened by the Gentiles. But his enemies knew him too well to give him such an opportunity.

We must also protest against the attempt to represent this vulgar swindler as a sincere enthusiast. 'There is much in his 'later career,' says Mr. Mayhew, 'which seems to prove that 'he really believed what he asserted — that he imagined him-'self the inspired of heaven . . . . and the companion of 'angels.' The reason given for this charitable hypothesis is, that 'Joseph Smith, in consequence of his pretensions to be a 'seer and prophet, lived a life of continual misery and persecu-'tion;' and that if he had not been supported by 'faith in his 'own high pretensions and divine mission,' he would have 'renounced his *unprofitable* and ungrateful task, and sought 'refuge in private life and honourable industry.' The answer to such representations is obvious: First, so far from Joseph's scheme being 'unprofitable,' it raised him from the depths of poverty to unbounded wealth. Secondly, he had from his earliest years shrunk from 'honourable industry,' and preferred fraud to work. Thirdly, so far from his having lived in 'con-'tinual misery and persecution,' he gained by his successful imposture the means of indulging every appetite and passion. During the fourteen years which intervened between his invention of Mormonism and his death, the only real persecution which he suffered was when his bankruptcy at Kirtland compelled him to share the fortunes of his followers in Missouri. And as to the risks of life and limb to which he was exposed,

they were nothing to those which every soldier encounters for a shilling a day.

It is inexplicable how any one who had ever looked at Joseph's portrait, could imagine him to have been by possibility an honest man. Never did we see a face on which the hand of heaven had more legibly written rascal. That self-complacent simper, that sensual mouth, that leer of vulgar cunning, tell us at one glance the character of their owner. Success, the criterion of fools, has caused many who ridicule his creed to magnify his intellect. Yet we can discover in his career no proof of conspicuous ability. Even the plan of his imposture was neither original nor ingenious. It may be said that, without great intellectual power, he could not have subjected so many thousands to his will, nor formed them into so flourishing a commonwealth. But it must be remembered that when subjects are firmly persuaded of the divinity of their sovereign, government becomes an easy task. Even with such advantages, Smith's administration was by no means successful. He was constantly involved in difficulties which better management would have avoided, and which the policy of his successor has overcome. We are inclined to believe that the sagacity shown in the construction of his ecclesiastical system belonged rather to his lieutenants than to himself; and that his chief, if not his only talent, was his gigantic impudence. This was the rock whereon he built his church; and his success proves how little ingenuity is needed to deceive mankind.

The men of Illinois imagined that the death of the false prophet would annihilate the sect; and the opinion was not unreasonable. For it seemed certain that there would be a contest among the lieutenants of Joseph for his vacant throne; and it was probable that the Church would thus be shattered into fragments mutually destructive. Such a contest, indeed, did actually occur; and four claimants, Sidney Rigdon, William Smith, Lyman Wight, and Brigham Young, disputed the allegiance of the faithful. But the latter was unanimously supported by the Apostolic College, of which he was chairman. This body was obeyed by the great majority of the inhabitants of Nauvoo; and a General Council of the Church, summoned about six weeks after Joseph's death, excommunicated the other pretenders, and even ventured to 'deliver over to Satan' the great Rigdon himself, although their Sacred Books declared him equal with the Prophet; who had, however, latterly shown a disposition to slight and humble him. The Mormons throughout the world acquiesced in this decision; and Brigham Young

was established in the post of 'Seer, Revelator, and President of 'the Latter Day Saints.'

The first months of the new reign were tolerably peaceful. The enemies of Zion were satisfied with the fatal blow which they had dealt; and the saints were suffered to gather the harvest of that year without disturbance. But in the following winter it became evident to the independent electors of Illinois that the sect, far from being destroyed, was becoming more formidable than ever. New emigrants still continued to pour into Nauvoo; and the temple was daily rising above the sacred hill, in token of defiance. Exasperated by these visible proofs of their failure, the inhabitants of the nine adjoining counties met together, and formed an alliance for the extermination of their detested neighbours.

Henceforward it was evident that while the Mormons continued to inhabit Nauvoo, they must live in a perpetual state of siege, and till their fields with a plough in one hand and a rifle in the other. Moreover, experience had shown that elements of disunion existed even among themselves. So long as they were established in any of the settled States, they could not exclude unbelievers from among them. There must always be Gentile strangers who would intrude among the saints for lucre's sake, and form a nucleus round which disappointed or traitorous members might rally, and create internal conflict. This could only be avoided by the transplantation of the Mormon commonwealth beyond the reach of foreign contact. Actuated by these reasons, the leaders who met to deliberate on the steps demanded by the crisis, came to a decision which, adventurous as it seemed, has proved no less wise than bold. They resolved to migrate in a body, far beyond the boundaries of the United States, and to interpose a thousand miles of wilderness between themselves and the civilised world. In the fastnesses of the Rocky Mountains, the Alps of North America, they determined to seek that freedom, civil and religious, which was denied them by their countrymen. In a hymn composed for the occasion, they express this Phocæan resolution as follows: —

'We'll burst off all our fetters, and break the Gentile yoke,
For long it has beset us, but now it shall be broke.
No more shall Jacob bow his neck;
Henceforth he shall be great and free
In Upper California.
Oh, that's the land for me!
Oh, that's the land for me!' (*Hymns*, 353.)

Their decision was announced to the saints throughout the world by a General Epistle, which bears date Jan. 20. 1846.

It was also communicated to their hostile neighbours, who agreed to allow the Mormons time to sell their property, on condition that they should leave Nauvoo before the ensuing summer. A pioneer party of sixteen hundred persons started before the conclusion of winter, in the hope of reaching their intended settlement in time to prepare a reception for the main body by the close of autumn. But the season was unusually cold, and their supply of food proved inadequate. Intense suffering brought on disease, which rapidly thinned their numbers. Yet the survivors pressed on undauntedly, and even provided for their friends who were to follow, by laying out farms in the wilderness, and planting them with grain. Thus they struggled onwards, from the Mississippi to the Missouri, on the banks of which they encamped, beyond the limits of the States, not far from the point of its junction with its great tributary, the Platte. They had resolved to settle in some part of the Californian territory, which then belonged to Mexico; and it happened that at this time the Mexican war having begun, the Government of the Union wished to march a body of troops into California, and invited the Mormon emigrants to furnish a body of five hundred volunteers for the service. This requisition is now represented by the Mormons as a new piece of persecution. Yet they complied with it at the time without hesitation; and five hundred of their number were thus conveyed across the continent at the expense of Government; and yet rejoined their brethren among the Rocky Mountains in the following summer, after having discovered the Californian gold diggings on their way. As no compulsion was exercised, it is evident that the Mormon leaders must have judged it expedient thus to diminish their numbers, which were at that time too great for their means of support. But it is admitted by Captain Stansbury (the officer employed by the United States in the survey of Utah) that the drain of this Mexican battalion prevented the remainder of the pioneers from reaching the Mountains that season. They, therefore, formed an encampment on the banks of the Missouri, where they were joined in the course of the summer and autumn by successive parties from Nauvoo. Meanwhile those who had remained in the city occupied themselves, during the precarious truce which they enjoyed, in finishing their temple. This building, the completion of which had been invested with a mysterious importance by the revelations of their prophet, was a huge and ugly pile of limestone, strongly resembling Bloomsbury Church. But as it was far superior in architectural pretensions to any of the meeting-houses in the neighbouring States, it was looked upon in the West as a miracle

of art. The Mormon High Priests returned from their frontier camp to consecrate it on the day of its completion, in May, 1846. The following sample of the consecration service will probably satisfy our readers: —

> 'Ho, ho! for the Temple's completed,
> The Lord hath a place for His head;
> The priesthood in power now lightens
> The way of the living and dead.
> See, see! 'mid the world's dreadful splendours,
> *Christianity, folly, and sword,*
> The Mormons, the diligent Mormons,
> Have reared up this House to the Lord.'
>
> (*Hymns*, 333.)

This ceremony had a disastrous influence on the fortunes of the remaining citizens. 'It was construed,' says Colonel Kane, 'to indicate an insincerity on the part of the Mormons as to 'their stipulated departure, or at least a hope of return; and 'their foes set upon them with renewed bitterness. . . . . 'A vindictive war was waged upon them, from which the 'weakest fled in scattered parties, leaving the rest to make a 'reluctant and almost ludicrously unavailing defence, till the '17th of September, when 1625 troops entered Nauvoo, and 'drove forth all who had not retreated before that time.'

Thus, once more, the lawless tyranny of a majority trampled down the rights of a minority. These instances of triumphant outrage, which have recurred so often in our narrative, are not only striking as pictures of American life, but may also furnish an instructive warning to some among ourselves. They force upon us the conclusion, that laws are not more willingly obeyed because made by universal suffrage. They teach us that in those communities where every man has an equal share in legislation, the ordinances of the legislature are treated with a contemptuous disregard, for which the history of other nations can furnish no precedent. The mob, knowing that they can enact laws when they please, infer that they may dispense with that formality at discretion, and accomplish their will directly, without the intermediate process of recording it in the statute-book. They can make the law, therefore they may break the law; as the barbarous Romans claimed the right of killing the sons they had begotten.

We must refer to Colonel Kane for a picturesque account of the appearance of Nauvoo after its desertion, and of the sufferings of its helpless citizens, who were driven across the Mississippi by their foes. It was with pain and toil that these last unfortunate exiles reached the camp of their brethren. 'Like

'the wounded birds of a flock fired into towards nightfall, they 'came straggling on with faltering steps, many of them without 'bag or baggage, all asking shelter or burial, and forcing a fresh 'repartition of the already divided rations of their friends.' At last, towards the close of autumn, all these emigrants had rejoined the main body, in the valley of the Missouri. And there they prepared to meet the severity of winter, in the depth of an Indian wilderness. The stronger members of the party had employed the summer in cutting and storing hay for the cattle, and in laying up such supplies of food as they could obtain. But these labours had been interrupted by a destructive fever, bred by the pestilential vapours of the marshy plain, which decimated their numbers. When winter came upon them, they were but ill prepared to meet it. For want of other shelter, they were fain to dig caves in the ground, and huddle together there for warmth. Many of the cattle died of starvation; and the same fate was hardly escaped by the emaciated owners.

At length the spring came to relieve their wretchedness. Out of twenty thousand Mormons who had formed the population of Nauvoo and its environs, little more than three thousand were now assembled on the Missouri. Of the rest, many had perished miserably; and many had dispersed in search of employment, to await a more convenient season for joining their friends. The hardiest of the saints who still adhered to the camp of Israel, were now organised into a company of pioneers; and they set out, to the number of 143 men, up the valley of the Platte, to seek a home among the Rocky Mountains. They carried rations for six months, agricultural implements, and seed grain; and were accompanied by the President and his chief counsellors. After a three months' journey, they reached the valley of the Great Salt Lake on the 21st of July. And here they determined to bring their wanderings to a close, and to establish a 'Stake of Zion.'* But they had small time to rest from their fatigues. Immediately on their arrival a fort was erected to secure them against the Indians, with log houses opening upon a square, into which they drove their cattle at night. 'In five days a field was consecrated, fenced, ploughed, 'and planted.' (*G.* 134.) Before the autumn they were re-

* All the Mormon settlements are called '*Stakes* of *Z*ion' to distinguish them from Jackson County, Missouri, which is 'Zion.' This is ultimately to be reconquered by the saints, and thus Joseph's prophecy (which their expulsion seemed to falsify), is to be fulfilled. Meanwhile, when speaking popularly, they apply the term Zion to Utah.

joined by their brethren whom they had left on the Missouri. This large body, consisting of about three thousand persons, including many women and children, journeyed across the unknown desert with the discipline of a veteran army. Colonel Kane, who had been an eye-witness, describes with admiration

'The strict order of march, the unconfused closing up to meet attack, the skilful securing of cattle upon the halt, the system with which the watches were set at night to guard the camp. . . . Every ten of their waggons was under the care of a captain; this captain of ten obeyed a captain of fifty; who in turn obeyed a member of the *High Council of the Church*.'

By the aid of this admirable organisation, they triumphed over the perils of the wilderness; and after a weary pilgrimage of a thousand miles, came at last within view of their destined home. The last portion of their route, which led them into the defiles of the mountains, was the most difficult:—

'When the last mountain has been crossed, the road passes along the bottom of a deep ravine, whose scenery is of almost terrific gloom. At every turn the overhanging cliffs threaten to break down upon the river at their base. At the end of this defile, which is five miles in length, the emigrants come abruptly out of the dark pass into the lighted valley, on a terrace of its upper table land. A ravishing panoramic landscape opens out below them, blue, and green, and gold, and pearl; a great sea with hilly islands; a lake; and broad sheets of grassy plain; all set as in a silver-chased cup, within mountains whose peaks of perpetual snow are burnished by a dazzling sun.'

The sympathy which we so freely give to the shout of the ten thousand Greeks, hailing the distant waters of the Euxine, we cannot refuse to the rapture of these Mormon pilgrims, when at last they beheld the promised land from the top of their transatlantic Pisgah. Nor is it wonderful that their superstition discovered in the aspect of their new inheritance an assurance of blessing; for the region which they saw below them bears, in its geographical features, a resemblance singularly striking to the Land of Canaan. The mountain lake of Galilee, the Jordan issuing from its waves, and the salt waters of the Dead Sea, where the river is absorbed and lost, have all their exact parallels in the territory of Utah. Here surely was the portion of Jacob, where the wanderings of Israel might find rest!

The arrival of these wayworn exiles, together with that of the disbanded volunteers from California, raised the number of the colony to nearly four thousand persons. The first thing needful was to provide that this multitude should not perish for lack of food. 'Ploughing and planting,' says Captain Stans-

bury, 'continued throughout the whole winter, and until the 'July following; by which time a line of fence had been con-'structed enclosing upwards of six thousand acres, laid down in 'crops, besides a large tract of pasture land.' But, notwithstanding all their industry, the colonists were on the brink of starvation during the first winter. There is very little game in the country, and they were reduced to the necessity of feeding on wild roots and on carrion; and even tore off the hides with which they had roofed their cabins, to boil them down into soup. 'When we clambered the mountains,' says one of them, 'with the Indians, to get leeks, we were sometimes too feeble to 'pull them out of the ground.' (*XV.* 387.) This bitter season, however, saw the last of their sufferings; an abundant harvest relieved their wants; and since that time their agriculture has been so successful, that they have raised enough, not only for home consumption, but for the demand of the numerous emigrants who are constantly passing through their settlements to the gold diggings of California. The engineers of the Central Government who surveyed their territory, state, that although the soil capable of cultivation bears a very small proportion to that which (for want of water) is doomed to sterility, yet the strip of arable land along the base of the mountains makes up, by its prodigious fertility, for its small extent (*S.* 141.); and that it would support, with ease, a million of inhabitants. (*G.* 18.) This question is of primary importance, because a country so distant from the sea, and so far from all other civilised states, must depend entirely on its own resources. There must be a constant danger lest an unfavourable season should be followed by a famine. Against such a calamity, however, some provision is made by accumulating large quantities of grain in public storehouses, where the hierarchical government deposits the tithes which it receives in kind.

In physical prosperity, the new commonwealth, which is still (in 1854) only in the sixth year of its foundation, has advanced with a rapidity truly wonderful; especially when we consider the disadvantages under which it is placed, by the fact that every imported article has to be dragged by land carriage for a thousand miles over roadless prairies, bridgeless rivers, and snow-clad mountains. Thus reduced to self-dependence, we can imagine the straits to which the first emigrants were brought for want of those innumerable comforts of civilised life which cannot be extemporised, and need cumbersome machinery for their manufacture. We can understand why, even after some years of settlement, the new citizens complained that nineteen-twentieths of the most common articles of clothing and

furniture were not to be procured among them at any price. (*XV.* 395.) But before their steady energy, such difficulties have gradually vanished. When the colony had barely reached its fifth birthday, besides their agricultural triumphs already mentioned, they had completed an admirable system of irrigation, had built bridges over their principal rivers, and possessed iron-works and coal-mines, a factory of beet-sugar, a nail-work, and innumerable sawing-mills; and had even sacrificed to the graces by 'a manufactory of small-tooth combs!' (*XV.* 418. and 437.) Regular mails were established with San Francisco on the Pacific, and New York on the Atlantic; public baths were erected, and copiously supplied by the boiling springs of the volcanic region, affording to the citizens that wholesome luxury so justly appreciated by the ancients and so barbarously neglected by the moderns. They were even beginning to cultivate the arts and sciences, *more Americano.* They had founded a 'University' in their capital, where one of the apostles gives lectures on astronomy, wherein he overthrows the Newtonian theory. (*G.* 82.) They had sculptured a monument to the memory of Washington. They had laid the foundation of a temple which is to surpass the architectural splendours of Nauvoo. They had reared a Mormon Sappho, who officiates as the laureate of King Brigham. Nay, they had even organised a dramatic association, which acts tragedies and comedies during the season.

Meanwhile, their population had increased by immigration from 4000 to 30,000, of whom 7000 were assembled in the city of Salt Lake, their capital. The rest were scattered over the country, to replenish the earth and to subdue it. This task they undertake, not with the desultory independence of isolated squatters, but with a centralised organisation, the result of which, in giving efficiency to the work of energetic men, has astonished (says Captain Stansbury) even those by whom it has been effected. He adds,—

> 'The mode which they adopt for the founding of a new town is highly characteristic. An expedition is first sent out to explore the country, with a view to the selection of the best site. An elder of the Church is then appointed to preside over the band designated to make the first improvement. This company is composed partly of volunteers, and partly of such as are selected by the Presidency, due regard being had to a proper intermixture of mechanical artisans to render the expedition independent of all aid from without.' (*S.* 142.)

But the effects of this system will be better understood by quoting the following letter of an emigrant, who thus describes

the foundation of one of the most important of these new settlements.

'In company of upward of an hundred waggons, I was sent on a mission with G. A. Smith, one of the Twelve, to Iron County, 270 miles south of Salt Lake, in the depth of winter, to form a settlement in the valley of Little Salt Lake, (now Parowan), as a preparatory step to the manufacturing of iron. After some difficulty in getting through the snow, we arrived safe and sound in the valley. After looking out a location, we formed our waggons into two parallel lines, some seventy paces apart; we then took the boxes from the wheels and planted them about a couple of paces from each other, so securing ourselves that we could not easily be taken advantage of by any unknown foe. This done, we next cut a road up the cañon, [ravine], opening it to a distance of some eight miles, bridging the creek in some five or six places, making the timber and poles (of which there is an immense quantity) of easy access. We next built a large meeting house, two stories high, of large pine trees all neatly jointed together. We next built a square fort, with a commodious cattle yard inside the enclosure. The houses built were some of hewn logs, and some of *adobies* (dried bricks) all neat and comfortable. We next enclosed a field, five by three miles square, with a good ditch and pole fence. We dug canals and water ditches to the distance of thirty or forty miles. One canal to turn the water of another creek upon the field, for irrigating purposes, was seven miles long. We built a saw-mill and grist-mill the same season. I have not time to tell you half the labours we performed in one season. Suffice it to say that when the Governor came along in the spring, he pronounced it the greatest work done in the mountains by the same amount of men.' (*XV.* 458.)

We must not be tempted to linger too long on this part of our subject, or we might illustrate it by many similar examples. Suffice it to say, that by such judicious enterprise a chain of agricultural posts has been formed, which already extends beyond the territory of Utah, and connects the Salt Lake with the Pacific. The chief of these settlements, San Bernardino, bids fair to be one of the most important cities in California. 'The agricultural interest of the colonists of San Bernardino,' says the 'New York Herald,' 'is larger than that of the three 'adjoining counties united. Their manufacturing interest is 'rapidly increasing. They supply the southern country with 'timber, and for miles around they furnish flour from the fine 'mills which they have erected. They have purchased land for town sites in eligible situations on the sea coast.' (*XV.* 61.) The object of the Mormons in this extended colonisation is to establish a good line of communication with the Pacific, by which they may bring up their immigrants more easily than across the immense tract which separates them from the Missouri.

At first they hoped to include this line of coast in their own territory; but Congress refused their petition to that effect, and restricted them within limits which separate them from the sea; the above-mentioned maritime colonies being offshoots beyond their own jurisdiction.

But we are here assuming a knowledge of the political relations between the Mormon commonwealth and the United States, which we have not yet described. Soon after the exiles had taken possession of their new home, it passed from the dominion of Mexico to that of the United States by the treaty of 1848. Not long after, a convention of the inhabitants petitioned Congress to admit them into the Confederation as a Sovereign State, under the title of the State of Deseret, a name taken from the Book of Mormon. This the Congress declined; but passed an Act, in 1850, erecting the Mormon district into a *Territory*, under the name of Utah. We should explain that, according to the American Constitution, the position of a *Territory* is very inferior to that of a *state*. The chief officers of a Territory are appointed not by the inhabitants, but by the President of the Union. The acts of the local legislature are null and void unless ratified by Congress. The property in the soil belongs to the Government of the United States. It will easily be understood how natural is the anxiety of the citizens of a Territory to emerge from this humiliating position, into that of a sovereign commonwealth, which can elect its own magistrates, make its own laws, and adopt the constitution which it prefers. But this anxiety is doubly felt by the Mormons, because, so long as they remain subject to the central Government of the Union, they naturally fear that the popular hatred which expelled them from Illinois and Missouri, may manifest itself in renewed persecution. Nor are causes of collision wanting. In the first place, the inhabitants of Utah have as yet no legal title to their land, for they have taken possession of it without purchase; and the ownership of the soil is in the United States. Yet the Mormons naturally protest against claims which would exact payment from them for that property which derives all its value from their successful enterprise. Again, the President of the Union has the right of appointing an 'unbeliever' Governor of the Territory. Such an appointment would be considered a grave insult by the population; and they have announced very clearly their intention to oppose it (should it ever take place) by passive resistance, which probably would soon pass into active violence. President Fillmore avoided this difficulty by nominating the Head of the Mormon Church as Governor of the Territory.

But the appointment is only for four years, and may be cancelled at pleasure. Another cause of apprehended quarrel is the Mormon custom of polygamy. The Territorial Legislature has no power of legalising this practice, and consequently the majority of the children of all the great officers of the Church are illegitimate in the eye of the law. Probably some child of a first wife will seek on this ground to oust his half brothers from the paternal inheritance. The Courts of the United States must necessarily give judgment in favour of his claim. But it is certain that such a judgment could not be enforced in Utah without military force, which would be enthusiastically resisted by the population. This particular case, indeed, may not arise for some years. But the indignation excited against the Mormon polygamy is such, that a portion of the American press is already urging an armed intervention on the Government.

'Not only (says the Philadelphia Register) should Utah be refused admission into the Union, so long as she maintains this abominable domestic institution; but Congress, under its power to make all needful regulations respecting the territory of the United States, should take measures to punish a crime which dishonours our nation.' (*XV.* 358.)

Such are the clouds already visible on the horizon of Utah, which portend a coming storm. One collision has actually occurred, but has passed off without serious effects. It was caused by the unpopularity of two judges, appointed by the President of the United States. No doubt it was very difficult to find among the Mormons any even moderately qualified for such an office. One provincial practitioner was however found, who, though not a resident in Utah, was brother of an Apostle; and he was nominated to a seat upon the bench. But the two other judges were 'unbelievers'; and this circumstance of itself caused them to be received with coldness. One of them, also, gave great offence by a speech at a public meeting, in which he advised the Mormon ladies '*to become virtuous.*' (*XIV.* 406.) The Governor, whose own harem was present, resented this as a gross insult, and an open quarrel ensued. Very free language was used as to the resolution of the people of Utah to resist any interference on the part of the Central Government. This language was declared treasonable by the two unbelieving Judges, and by the Secretary of the Territory, who all returned to Washington, and in a report to Government denounced the disloyalty of the Territory which they had deserted. In the sublime language of the 'Deseret News,'—

'The Judicial Ermine doffed its desecrated wand to the ladies of Utah, satanlike rebuking sin; blackened the sacred pages of its country's history with the records of a mock court; *shook its shaggy mane* in disappointed wrath, and rushed *with rapid strides* over the mountains to its orient den.' (*XIV.* 524.)

President Fillmore, however, wisely forbore to take up the quarrel of his nominees, and made new appointments, which appear to be more acceptable to the Mormon population. Thus the danger has passed over for the time; but such symptoms show the precarious character of the existing peace.

Meanwhile, the Mormon leaders are taking every measure which is calculated to secure themselves against a repetition of the exterminating process to which they have been so often subjected. They keep their militia in constant drill, and its discipline is said to be excellent. Every man capable of bearing arms is enrolled, and the apostles, bishops, and elders appear in military uniform as majors, colonels, or generals, at the head of their troops. They could already oppose a force of 8000 men to an invading enemy. And the standing army of the United States only amounts to 10,000, which must march for three months through a wilderness before they reached the defiles of the mountains, where they would find themselves opposed, under every disadvantage of ground, with all the fury of fanaticism. Indeed, Lieutenant Gunnison intimates that, in his opinion, the Mormons might already defy any force which could be sent against them.

The causes above mentioned fully account for the eagerness manifested by the heads of the Church in pressing upon the saints throughout the world the duty of emigrating to Utah. Their power of resisting hostile interference must of course be proportionate to their numerical strength. If they can double their present population, they may defend their mountain fastnesses against the world. Moreover, they will have the right, according to the practice of the Union, to demand admission as a State into the Federation, when their population amounts to 60,000. Hence the duty most emphatically urged upon all Mormon proselytes is immediate emigration. They must shake from their feet the dust of 'Babylon,' and hasten to 'Zion.' 'Every saint,' says a recent General Epistle, 'who does not 'come *home*, will be afflicted by the devil.' (*XIV.* 20.) And again, 'Zion is our home, the place which God has appointed 'for the refuge of his people. Every particle of our means 'which we use in Babylon is a loss to ourselves.' (*Ibid.* 210.) And the elders are exhorted 'to thunder the word of the 'Almighty to the saints, to arise and come to Zion.' (*Ibid.* 201.)

Nor are their efforts confined to words of exhortation. They raise annually a considerable sum, under the name of the *Perpetual Emigration Fund*, to pay the outfit and passage of those who are willing to emigrate but unable to pay their own expenses. This fund amounted last year to 34,000 dollars. (*XV.* 439.) Most of the emigrants, however, pay for themselves. In 1853, the number of saints who sailed from England was 2609 (*Ibid.* 264.); among whom 2312 were British subjects, and 297 Danes. Only 400 of these had their passage paid by the fund. The whole Mormon emigration from Europe has hitherto been considerably under 3000 annually. Even including the converts from the United States, only 3000 settlers arrived in Utah in 1851. These details, which we have collected from the official statistics published in the 'Star,' will show how grossly the Mormon emigration has been exaggerated by the press. The American papers, with their usual grandiloquence, are constantly telling us that hundreds of thousands have arrived on their way to Utah; and these fables are copied on this side of the Atlantic, and go the round of Europe. In reality, during the fourteen years from 1837 to 1851, under 17,000 Mormons had emigrated from England. In future, however, while the Emigration Fund continues in operation, the rate will probably be not less than 3000 a-year. We may therefore suppose that, including the proselytes from the Union, the census of Utah will be increased by 3500 annually. Besides this, we may allow, perhaps, 1000 per annum (considering the nature of the population) for the average excess of births over deaths during the time that the population is rising from 30,000 to 60,000. On this hypothesis, it will have reached the required number by 1859.

This emigration, though very insignificant when compared with the exaggerated statements above mentioned, is surprisingly great when we consider the enormous difficulties by which it is impeded. In fact, if we except the capital of Thibet, there is perhaps no city in the world so difficult to reach as the metropolis of the Mormons. Emigrants from Europe must first undertake the long sea voyage to New Orleans; thence they must proceed by steamer up the Mississippi to St. Louis, a distance of 1300 miles. From St. Louis, a farther voyage of 800 miles brings them to the junction of the Missouri and the Platte. From thence they must proceed in waggons across the wilderness, a journey of three weary months, before they reach their final destination. The appearance of these trains of pilgrims must be highly curious and picturesque. Captain Stansbury thus describes one of them, which he passed: —

'We met ninety-five waggons to-day, containing the advance of the Mormon emigration. Two large flocks of sheep were driven before the train; and geese and turkeys had been conveyed in coops the whole distance, without apparent damage. One old gander poked his head out of his box, and hissed most energetically at every passer by, as if to show that his spirit was still unbroken, notwithstanding his long confinement. The waggons swarmed with women and children, and I estimated the train at a thousand head of cattle, a hundred head of sheep, and five hundred human souls.' (*S.* 223.)

'The waggon,' he tells us elsewhere, 'is literally the emigrant's home. In it he carries his all, and it serves him as tent, kitchen, parlour, and bed-room; and not unfrequently also as a boat, to ferry his load over an otherwise impassable stream.' (*S.* 26.)

The deluded proselytes, who, in the mere act of reaching the parched valleys of Deseret, expend an amount of capital and toil sufficient to establish them with every comfort in many happier colonies, are by no means drawn from the most ignorant portion of the community. More than two-thirds of their number consist of artisans and mechanics. Out of 352 emigrants who sailed from Liverpool in February 1852, Mr. Mayhew ascertained that only 108 were unskilled labourers; the remaining 244 consisted of farmers, miners, engine-makers, joiners, weavers, shoemakers, smiths, tailors, watch-makers, masons, butchers, bakers, potters, painters, ship-wrights, iron-moulders, basket-makers, dyers, ropers, paper-makers, glass-cutters, nailors, saddlers, sawyers, and gun-makers. (*M. Illust.* 245.) Thus the Mormon emigration is drawn mainly from a single class of society; and the result is, that the population of Utah presents an aspect singularly homogeneous, and has attained (without any socialism) more nearly to the socialist ideal of a dead level than any other community in the world. There are no poor, for the humblest labourer becomes on his arrival a peasant proprietor; and, although, some have already grown rich, yet none are exempt from the necessity of manual labour, except, indeed, the prophets and chief apostles of the Church. And even these seek to avert popular envy, by occasionally taking a turn at their old employments; following the example of the President, who was bred a carpenter, and still sometimes does a job of joiner's work upon his mills. (*G.* 141.) Such a state of society combines the absence of many evils and much misery, with the want of those humanising influences which result from the intermixture of men of leisure with men of labour.

But it is time to turn from the outward phenomena of Mormonism to its inward life; from its relations towards the exter-

nal world, to its own internal system, theological, ethical, and ecclesiastical. And since those who join it, join it as a Religion, let us first examine the doctrines which it teaches, and which they accept.

We have already said that the original Theology of Mormonism was not distinguished by any marked peculiarities. And even still, those who preach it to the ignorant and simple disguise it under the mask of ordinary Protestantism, and affect to differ from rival sects rather in their pretensions than in their doctrines. The order lately given to the English elders was to abstain from perplexing their hearers with startling novelties, and only 'to preach faith, repentance, baptism for the remission 'of sins, and *faith in Joseph Smith and Brigham Young.*' (*XIV.* 226.) Even the more intelligent English converts, when asked wherein they differ from other sects, reply that the difference consists in their claim to possess miraculous gifts and a living prophet.

These *gifts,* which they profess to exercise, are the powers of healing the sick, speaking in tongues, and casting out devils. The former (which they found on the well-known passage in St. James) they put in practice on every occasion of illness. Not a month passes without some miraculous case of cure being published in their journals. In reading these narratives, we might almost think we had stumbled on an advertisement of Morrison's pills. 'The consequence,' says Elder Spencer, 'of 'changing this one ordinance to the medical nostrums of men, 'is the literal death of thousands.'

The *Gift of Tongues* is of still easier execution, and forms a frequent incident in the public worship of the sect. Thus we read, in the official report of a recent Conference at Utah: —

'Sister Bybee *spoke in tongues.* President Young declared it to be a *proper tongue,* and inquired *what the nations would do, if they were here.* He said, *if he were to give way to the brethren and sisters, the day of Pentecost would be in the shade in comparison to it.*' (*XIV.* 356.)

This is sufficiently profane; but still more disgusting are the scenes which take place in the casting out of devils. Daniel Jones, now one of the three 'Presidents of the Church in Wales,'* thus describes a case in which he officiated as exorciser: —

'The spirits were all this time making the loudest noise; calling out "*Old Captain, have you come to trouble us? d—d Old Captain, "we will hold you a battle.*" Many other expressions used would

* M. Star, *XV.* 511.

be indecent to utter, and others useless, I suppose. Some spoke English, through one that knew no English of herself. Others spoke in tongues, praying for a reinforcement of their kindred spirits, and chiding some dreadfully by name, such as *Borona*, *Menta*, *Philo*. They swore they would not depart, *unless old Brigham Young, from America, would come.*' (*Star*, *XI.* 40., quoted in *Morm. Illust.*)

We should have been inclined to infer from such descriptions that the performers in these exhibitions must either be the most shameless of hypocrites, or the most crazy of fanatics. But we are silenced when we remember that two English clergymen have also very lately published their dialogues with devils; and have surpassed their Mormon rivals in absurdity, inasmuch as they have fixed the residence of Satan, not in the heart of a man, but in the legs of a table.*

The resemblance thus manifested between the teaching of some of our popular religionists, and that of the Mormons, is not confined to the point of diabolic agency. It results from a materialistic tendency observable in the two theological systems. Besides some other effects, this leads both alike to misconstrue the metaphors of Scripture by a literal interpretation, and to distort the biblical prophecies by viewing them through a carnal medium. Thus, the Mormonite speculations on the Restoration of the Jews, and on the Millennium, are the same which may sometimes be heard in Puritanic pulpits. Both schools dwell with similar fondness on the battle of Armageddon, and give a description of the combatants equally minute. The Mormons teach that this contest will be between the Papists on one side and 'the Church' on the other. The triumph of their own adherents is to usher in the Millennium. Even the date assigned to the Restoration of the Jews is the same in both systems. 'It shall come to pass in the nineteenth century,' says the official organ of Mormonism, 'that the great trumpet shall be 'blown, and they [the Jews] shall come who are ready to perish 'in the land of Assyria, and the outcast in the land of Egypt, 'and shall worship the Lord in the holy mountain at Jerusalem.' (*XIV.* 12.).

But this tendency to debase a spiritual truth into a material fiction is most strikingly developed in the Mormon doctrine of the Resurrection. It must be confessed, indeed, that some Christian writers have incautiously spoken on this subject, in language contradicting that of St. Paul; and have seemed to teach that this corruptible body of flesh and blood will inherit

* An account of these publications is given in a most interesting article in the 'Quarterly' of last October, on the subject of Table-turning.

eternal life.* The danger of such incautious statements is shown by the inferences deduced from them in the writings of the Mormonites. According to their teaching, not only will the body, but all the habits, occupations, and necessities of life, be the same in the future world as in the present. Thus, one of their chief pillars tells us, that —

'The future residence of the saints is not an ideal thing. They will need houses for their persons and for their families as much in their *resurrected* condition as in their present state. In this identical world, where they have been robbed of houses, and lands, and wife, and children, they shall have an hundred fold.' (*Spencer*, 174.)

Another 'Apostle' calculates the exact amount of landed property which may be expected by the '*resurrected* saints':—

'Suppose that, out of the population of the earth, one in a hundred should be entitled to an inheritance upon the new earth, how much land would each receive? We answer, they would receive over a hundred and fifty acres, which would be quite enough to raise manna, and to build some splendid mansions. It would be large enough to have our flower gardens, and everything the agriculturist and the botanist want.' (*P. Pratt*, in *XIV.* 663.)

But not content with degrading the Scriptural conception of immortality by these sordid and grovelling imaginations, they venture directly to contradict the words of our Lord Himself, by affirming that, in the Resurrection, men both marry and are given in marriage. Thus the author above quoted tells us that —

'Abraham and Sarah will continue to multiply, not only in this world, but in all worlds to come. . . . . Will the resurrection return you a mere *female acquaintance*, that is *not* to be the wife of your bosom in eternity? No, God forbid. But it will restore you the wife of your bosom immortalised, who shall bear children from your own loins, in all worlds to come.' (*P.O.* 6.)

This they call the doctrine of *Celestial Marriage*, to which, in its connexion with their polygamy, we shall presently return.

A still more peculiar tenet of their creed is the necessity of *baptism for the dead*. This doctrine was broached by Smith at an early period, and is incorporated into the 'Book of Doctrines 'and Covenants,' the Mormonite New Testament.† Every Mormon is bound to submit to this rite for the benefit of his deceased relatives. Its institution seems to have had the same pecuniary

* See the admirable arguments of Dr. Burton, late Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, against certain popular views of this subject. (*Burton's Bampton Lectures*, Appendix.)

† See *D.C.*, sections 105, 106.

object as that of the masses *pro defunctis;* although the fees demanded by the priesthood for its performance are not stated in the official documents. They tell us, however, that the dead 'depend on their posterity, relatives, or friends for this 'completing of the works necessary for their salvation' (*XIV.* 232.); and that their genealogies will be revealed to the faithful by the prophets in the temple. (*Seer*, i. 141.) Thus (says Joseph Smith, in his "*last sermon*"): —

'Every man who has got a friend in the eternal world can save him, unless he has committed the unpardonable sin; so *you see how far you can be a saviour.*'

And to the same effect the Mormon hymnist sings: —

'I am Zionward bound, where a Seer is our head,
We'll there be baptized for our friends that are dead;
By obeying this law we may set them all free,
And *saviours we shall upon Mount Zion be.*'
(*XV.* 143.)

The Chancellor of the University of Deseret informs us, that 'unless this is done for the dead *they cannot be redeemed.*' (*Spencer*, 166.) And the same learned authority announces that —

'Peter tells how the devout and honourable dead may be saved, who never heard the gospel on earth. Says he, [St. Peter!] "else "why are they baptized for the dead?"'*

This Mormon sacrament is connected with another retrograde tenet, which restricts the due celebration of religious rites to one local sanctuary —

'Verily I say unto you, after you have had sufficient time to build a house to me, wherein the ordinance of baptizing for the dead belongeth, and for which the same was instituted from before the foundation of the world . . . . your baptisms for the dead by those who are scattered abroad, are not acceptable unto me.' (*D. C.* sec. 103.)

Hence the mysterious importance attached to the completion of the Nauvoo Temple. The corner-stone of a new and far larger edifice has lately been laid at Deseret, the form of which

* Mr. Spencer, who here cites the *1st Corinthians* as the work of St. Peter, was ordained as a Baptist minister, in America, and says that he graduated at 'Hamilton Theological College,' in 1829, and held 'the first grade of honourable distinction.' He complains that his character has been much 'vil*l*ified;' his spelling and grammar could scarcely be represented as viler than they are, by any of his 'vil*l*ifiers.'

has been represented to Brigham Young in a miraculous vision. He refuses to reveal its plan beforehand; but declares that, magnificent as it will be, it is only the faint image of that which will beautify reconquered Missouri. 'The time will come when 'there will be a tower in the centre of temples we shall build, 'and on its top *groves and fish ponds.*' (*XV.* 488.) What would Mr. Ruskin say to this proposed new style of ecclesiastical architecture? Mr. Gunnison tell us (from information given him at Utah) that as soon as the present temple is finished, '*animal sacrifices* for the daily sins of the people' will be offered therein by the priesthood. (*G.* 57.) This will complete the return of Mormonism to the 'weak and beggarly elements,' of that dispensation which was purposely adapted to a state of moral childhood, 'wherein were offered both gifts and sacrifices 'that could not make him that did the service perfect, as per-'taining to the conscience; which stood only in meats, and 'drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed 'until the time of reformation.'

The same retrogressive tendency has led the Mormonites to adopt a system of anthropomorphism which has never been equalled by any other sect, though it was approached fifteen centuries ago by the Egyptian monks whom Theophilus anathematised. Allegorical images, under which the attributes of God were made intelligible to the rude Israelites by Moses, and even metaphorical figures, adopted by devotional poetry in a later age, are interpreted by Smith and his disciples in a sense as merely literal and material, as they would attach to the placards wherein their countrymen describe the person of a fugitive slave. The nature of these materialising dogmas cannot be rendered intelligible except by quotations, which, from their profanity, we would willingly omit. The following is an extract from one of their popular catechisms, bearing on the subject: —

'*Q.* 28. What is God? — *A.* He is a *material* intelligent personage, possessing both body and parts.

'*Q.* 38. Doth He also possess passions? — *A.* Yes, He eats, He drinks, He loves, He hates.

'*Q.* 44. Can this being occupy two distinct places at once? — *A.* No.'*

To the same effect we read in the Mormon hymn-book (349.): —

'The God that others worship, is not the God for me;
He has no parts nor body, and cannot hear nor see.'

* Latter Day Saints' Catechism, quoted in *Morm. Illust.* p. 43.

A local residence is assigned to this anthropomorphic Deity; he lives, we are told, '*in the planet Kolob.*' (*Seer*, 70. and *XIV.* 531.) Moreover, as he possesses the body and passions of a man, so his relations to his creatures are purely human. Saint Hilary of Poitiers asserts that some Arians attacked orthodoxy by the following argument:—'Deus *pater* non erat, quia neque 'ei *filius;* nam si filius, necesse est ut et *fœmina* sit.' (*Hil. adv. Const.*) The conclusion thus stated as an absurdity in the fourth century, the Mormons embrace as an axiom in the nineteenth. '*In mundi primordiis, Deo erat fœmina,*' is an article of their creed. (*P. O.* p. 1. and p. 15.; also *Seer*, i. 38. and 103.) No existence is 'created'; all beings are 'begotten.' So the Prophet tells us in his "last sermon" (p. 62.):—

'God never did have power to create the spirit of man at all. The very idea lessens man in my estimation. I know better.'

The superiority of the Mormon God over his creatures consists only in the greater power which He has gradually attained by growth in knowledge. He himself originated in 'the union 'of two elementary particles of matter' (*G.* 49.); and by a progressive development reached the human form. Thus we read that—

'God, *of course*, was once a man, and from manhood by continual progression, became God; and he has continued to increase from his manhood to the present time, and may continue to increase without limit. And man also may continue to increase in knowledge and power as fast as he pleases.'

And again,

'If man is a creature of eternal progression, the time must certainly arrive when he will know as much as God now knows.' (*XIV.* 386.)

This is in strict accordance with the following words of Joseph Smith:—

'The weakest child of God which now exists upon the earth will possess more dominion, more property, more subjects, and more power and glory, than is possessed by Jesus Christ or by his Father; while at the same time they will have their dominion, kingdom, and subjects increased in proportion.' (*M. Star*, vi., quoted in *Morm. Illust.*)

An apostle carries this view into detail as follows:—

'What will man do when this world is filled up? Why, he will *make more worlds*, and swarm out like bees from the old world. And when a farmer has cultivated his farm and raised numerous children, so that the space is beginning to be too strait for them, he will say,

*My sons, yonder is plenty of matter, go and organise a world and people it.*' (*P. Pratt, in XIV.* 663. *and Seer*, 1. 37.)

This doctrine of indefinite development naturally passes into Polytheism. Accordingly, the Mormon theology teaches that there are Gods innumerable, with different degrees of dignity and power. It was revealed to Joseph Smith that the first verse of Genesis originally stood as follows:—'The *Head God* 'brought forth *the Gods*, with the heavens, and the earth.' (*XIV.* 455.) And the same prophet also tells us (*Ibid.*), that a hundred and forty-four thousand of these gods are mentioned by St. John in the Apocalypse. Moreover, 'each God is the 'God of the spirits of all flesh pertaining to the world which 'he forms.' (*Seer*, i. 38.) And it has been lately revealed by the President, that the God of our own planet is Adam (!), who (it seems) was only another form of the Archangel Michael (!).

'When our father Adam came into the Garden of Eden, he brought Eve, *one of his wives*, with him. He helped to make and organise this world. He is Michael, the Archangel, the *Ancient of Days*. He is our Father and our God, and *the only God with whom we have to do*.' (*From Discourses of the Presidency in XV.* 769.)

It is curious to observe, from such examples, how easily the extremes of materialism and immaterialism may be made to meet. For here we have the rudest form of anthropomorphism connected with a theory of emanation which might be identified with that of some Gnostic and Oriental idealists. But under its present intellectual guides, Mormonism is rapidly passing into that form of practical Atheism which is euphemistically termed Pantheism. Thus we read in the Washington organ of the Presidency, that the only thing which has existed from eternity is —

'An infinite quantity of *self-moving intelligent matter*. Every 'particle of matter which now exists, existed in the infinite 'depths of past duration, and was then capable of self-motion.' (*Seer*. i. 129.) 'There is no substance in the universe which 'feels and thinks now, but what has *eternally* possessed that capa-'city.' (*Ib.* 102.) 'Each individual of the *vegetable* and animal 'kingdom contains a living spirit, possessed of intelligent capa-'cities.' (*Ib.* 34.) 'Persons are only tabernacles, and *truth* is '*the God* that dwells in them. When we speak of only one 'God, and state that he is eternal, &c., we have no reference to 'any particular person, but to *truth dwelling in a vast variety of* '*substances*.' (*Ib.* 25.)

The same authority informs us that every man is an aggregate of as many intelligent individuals as there are elementary par-

ticles of matter in his system. (*Ib.* 103.) And so President Brigham, in a recent sermon, tells his hearers that the reward of the good will be a continual progress to a more perfect organisation, and the punishment of the bad will be a 'decom-'position into the particles that compose the native elements.' '(*B. Young*, in *XV.* 835.)

It is evident that in these latter portions of the Mormon creed we may recognise the speculations of Oken, Fichte, Hegel, and others, filtered through such popularising media as Emerson, Parker, and the 'Vestiges of Creation.' It would appear that the more startling of these innovations, which date from the last year of Smith's life, are due to Orson Pratt, the intellectual guide of recent Mormonism, under whose influence Joseph seems to have fallen, after he had quarrelled with Sidney Rigdon.

But, it may be asked, how can this be the theology of a sect which professes to receive the Bible as the Word of God? The answer is twofold. First, the Mormon writers teach that the Christian Revelation, though authoritative when first given, is now superseded by their own. 'The Epistles of the ancient 'Apostles, Paul, Peter, and John, we must say are dead letters, 'when compared to the Epistles that are written to the saints 'in our day by the living priesthood.' (*XIV.* 328.) And the possession of a living source of inspiration enables them to modify, not only the doctrines of the ancient Scriptures, but even the revelations of their own prophets. Thus Polygamy is pronounced in the Book of Mormon to be 'abominable 'before the Lord.' (*Jac.* chap. ii. sec. 6.); yet it was afterwards authorised in a new revelation by Joseph himself, and is now declared to be the special blessing of the latter covenant. But, secondly, lest this view should not satisfy all scruples, it was revealed to Smith that our present Scriptures have been grievously altered and corrupted, and he was divinely commissioned to make a revised and corrected edition of them. We find from his statement in his autobiography (*XIV.* 422. 451, 452.) that he lived to complete this emended Bible. But he never ventured to print it, and it still remains in manuscript among the muniments of the Church. It is to be published as soon as the world is ripe to receive it. Meanwhile some specimens have been given, among which one of the most remarkable is the beginning of Genesis, which we have quoted above.*

* Many extracts from this emended Bible have been lately published by Orson Pratt, in the *Seer*. The additions are so numerous as to double the scriptural text.

The existence of this secret Bible is an example of the Mormon practice of *reserve*, which forms a connecting link between their theological and their ethical system. The doctrines which they teach among the initiated may differ to any extent from those proclaimed to the Gentiles. 'If man receives all truths,' says their organ (*XV.* 507.), 'he must receive them on a gra-'duated scale. The *Latter Day Saints* act upon this simple, 'natural principle. Paul had *milk for babes* and *things unlawful* '*to utter*' (!). The most striking instance of this system of pious fraud is their persevering denial of the charge of polygamy. So boldly did they disavow the practice, that even the careful and accurate author of 'Mormonism Illustrated' was deceived by their asseverations; and though he states the accusations against them fairly, yet decides that, at least as against Smith, they were unfounded. At length, however, it became necessary to drop the mask. As the population of Utah increased, the practices prevalent there became better known to the world, through multiplying channels of communication. It was useless to repudiate an ordinance which must be so prominent in the first letters of every new citizen of Salt Lake to his English friends. The Church therefore decided that the time was come for publishing to the world the revelation which sanctioned their seraglios. We have already cited that singular document, which Joseph circulated among the initiated in the year before his death. Since its publication, which took place in 1852, the Mormonite leaders have completely thrown off the veil, and have defended polygamy as impudently as they before denied it. Tracts, dialogues, and hymns are circulated in its behalf. And even the '*pluralistic*' marriage service has been published. The following is an extract from this novel rubric:—

'The president [or his deputy *] calls upon the bridegroom and his [first] wife, and the bride to arise. The [first] wife stands on the left hand of her husband, while the bride stands on the wife's left. The president then says to the [first] wife, *Are you willing to give this woman to your husband, to be his lawful and wedded wife for time and for eternity? If you are, place her right hand within the right hand of your husband.*† The right hands of the bridegroom

* See MS. *XV.* 215.

† This would at first appear as if the wife possessed a veto. But the official organ informs us in the same article that if the wife refuses to consent to her husband's polygamy, '*then it is lawful for her* '*husband*, if permitted by revelation through the Prophet, *to be mar-*'*ried to others without her consent; and she will be condemned* '*because she did not give them unto him;* as Sarah gave Hagar unto 'Abraham, and as Rachael and Leah gave Bilhah and Zilpah unto 'Jacob.' (see also *XV.* 215.)

and bride being thus joined, the [first] wife takes her husband by the left arm, as if in the attitude of walking. The president then asks the man, *Do you, brother M., take sister N. by the right hand, to receive her unto yourself, to be your lawful and wedded wife?* . . . . The bridegroom answers, *Yes.* The president then asks the bride, *Do you, sister N., take brother M. and give yourself unto him to be his lawful and wedded wife?* &c. The bride answers, *Yes.* The president then says . . . . *By the authority of the holy priesthood, I pronounce you legally and lawfully* [sic] *husband and wife for time and for all eternity. And I seal upon you the blessings of the holy resurrection, with power to come forth in the morning of the first resurrection* . . . . *And I seal upon you* . . . . *the blessings of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and say unto you, be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth.* . . . . The benediction follows; and the scribe then enters the marriage on the record. (*Seer*, i. 31.)

It should be added, that the President possesses the Papal prerogative of annulling all marriages contracted under his sanction*; a prerogative which cannot fail to prove a source of wealth and power. As to marriages celebrated without his authority, they are *ipso facto* void, *in foro conscientiæ*. Consequently either man or woman is at liberty to desert an unbelieving spouse, and take another. An example of this occurred last year in a Welsh village, with which we are well acquainted. An old woman of sixty was converted by the Mormons, and persuaded to emigrate. She had a blind husband, seventy years of age, who entirely depended on her care. The neighbours cried shame on her for deserting her conjugal duties. The clergyman of the parish, and even her landlord the Squire, remonstrated in vain. She declared that 'the Lord had called 'her to come to Zion,' and that it was revealed to her that when she reached Deseret she should be restored to youth, or (as she expressed it) 'she should get a new skin.' And she unblushingly avowed her intention of being sealed to another husband, and bearing 'a young family' in America. The end of the story is tragic. The deserted husband died of a broken heart a fortnight after his wife's departure; and the old woman herself expired before she reached New Orleans, leaving the surplus of her outfit in the hands of her seducers.

It may easily be imagined that the public announcement of these matrimonial innovations excited much opposition, not only among believers, but also among the saints, and particularly among their wives. Even in Utah itself it seems that the customs of Constantinople are not popular with the fair sex. Lieutenant Gunnison tells us that 'he placed the subject before

* See *G.* 70. and *S.* 136.

'a young lady in its practical light,' and asked her, 'if she 'would consent to become Mrs. Blank, No. 20? or if, though 'ranking as No. 1, she would be contented, when the first 'flush of beauty had departed, to have her husband call at her 'domicile, and introduce his last bride, No. 17?' The subject, says the Lieutenant, was cut short by the reply, 'No, Sir, I 'would die first.' In England, as might be expected, the resistance has been more open and decided. One of the most amusing publications to which the controversy has given rise, is a 'Dialogue between Nelly and Abby,' published in the weekly organ of Mormonism. Nelly is a rebellious saint, and opens the discussion by addressing her more submissive cousin as follows:—

'Dear Cousin Abby, I have been very anxious to see you, ever since I heard of the *new revelation*. I know that nothing has ever come up yet in this Church that could stumble you. But I think now, when your John comes to get two or three more wives, you will feel as keenly as any of us.'

The believing Abby replies, by expressing her sorrow that her cousin's mind is 'so fluttered' with the new revelation. For her own part, she has 'never stumbled at any of the 'doctrines of the Church, because they all seem so pure.' In condescension, however, for Nelly's weakness, she proceeds to explain fully the arguments which have led her to surrender the exclusive possession of 'her John.' These are resisted by Nelly for some time. She cannot see 'what wisdom' there is in 'being tied to her George with a lot of other women, who 'can flatter and simper, and make him believe anything they 'please.' But at last she also is convinced, and exclaims, 'I 'am sorry I ever burnt that revelation! I would not have done 'it for the world if I had known as much as I do now.' She cannot help, however, adding a proviso, 'Well, if George does 'take any other, I should like him to take my sister Anne, for 'her temper is so obliging and mild.'*

The arguments by which the Mormon writers justify their adoption of these Oriental usages are principally drawn from the Old Testament. The pamphlet on 'Plurality of Wives,' at the head of our Article, informs us, that the Latter Day Saints have restored 'the family order which God established 'with Abraham and the Patriarchs.' (*P. O.* 1.) So we have just seen that in their new marriage service polygamy is designated as 'the blessing of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.' And the Mormon psalmist sings to the same tune —

* See M. Star, *XV.*, Nos. 15, 16.

'I am Zionward bound, where the blessings untold,
Which Jehovah conferred on his servants of old,
*And at which pious Christendom feels so annoyed,*
In this last dispensation again are enjoyed.'
(*XV.* 143.)

And so we are warned by Elder Spencer, that—

'When a man undervalues this promise, he not only shows himself to be destitute of saving faith, but he is very liable to become a *scoffer and mocker of the last days*, speaking evil of such dignities as *Abraham and Brigham*.' (*P. O.* 12.)

But it would be well if the apologists of polygamy confined themselves to the patriarchal dispensation. For some excuse might then be made for their mistake, considering the vague notions concerning the authority of the Old Testament which prevail among our popular religionists, and remembering that even in our pulpits we too often hear Isaac and Jacob cited as perfect exemplars of Christian life. But when they venture to quote the New Testament in support of their practices, we see at once the impudent dishonesty of the men. The Devil has often wrested Scripture to his purpose, but never before with such preposterous perversion and audacious profaneness as that displayed by Joseph Smith and his disciples. One feels indignant, not only at their hypocrisy, but at their folly, in expecting to persuade any one to acquiesce in such palpable distortion of plain words. Thus from the promise that, whatsoever a man shall leave for the Gospel's sake, *he shall receive an hundred fold* (Mark, x. 29.), the Chancellor of the University of Deseret deduces the following question and answer:—

'*Q.* What reward have men who have faith to forsake their rebellious and unbelieving wives in order to obey the commandments of God?

'*A.* AN HUNDRED FOLD OF WIVES in this world, and eternal life in the next. (*P. O.* 16.; *see also Seer*, 61.)

In the same treatise a carnal interpretation is given to the metaphor which designates the Church as 'the Bride.' But even these monstrous falsifications of Scripture are surpassed by the arguments which Mr. Hyde (the present chairman of the Apostolic College) extracts from the Gospel narrative itself.* Yet, although the omission of these renders our picture of Mormonism incomplete, we really dare not quote blasphemies

* See Orson Hyde's letter, published in the [Mormon] *Guardian*, and quoted by Mr. Gunnison, p. 68. The same blasphemies are repeated by Orson Pratt in *Seer*, 159. 169.

so revolting; especially when they are combined with absurdity at which the reader, even while he shuddered, must be provoked to smile.

Such profane distortion of the Sacred Writings is the less excusable in the Mormonite divines, because they have the power of fabricating new Scripture whenever they please. This power, indeed, they have freely exercised in defence of their harems. It has been revealed, that the measure of a man's 'wealth, power, and dominion' in the world to come will depend upon the number of his wives, all of whom will continue to belong to him after the resurrection, if they have been *sealed* to him by the President. Hence the term *celestial marriage*, which they apply to this connexion. Moreover, the first wife, if submissive, will rank as Queen over all the other concubines. In the tract above quoted Abby explains this to Nelly as follows:—

'I appreciate a kind intelligent husband, that is ordained and anointed like unto Abraham, to be king over innumerable myriads of the human family, so highly, that I shall not make myself a widow and servant through all eternity, by opposing what God has clearly revealed by all his prophets since the world began. . . . . The great question is this. Will we unite with the *plurality order* of ancient patriarchs, or will we consent to be doomed to eternal celibacy. This is the true division of the question. One or the other we must choose. We cannot be married to our husbands for eternity without subscribing to the law that admits a plurality of wives. . . . . If your George and you should be alone, by the side of such a king as Abraham or Solomon, with all his queens, and their numerous servants and waiting maids in courtly livery, would he not look like a mere rushlight by the side of such suns? . . . . Besides, a queen to him that has his hundreds of wives in eternity, with children as numberless as the stars of heaven, would receive intelligence, honour, and dominion, in some measure proportioned to the exaltation of her husband; while your George, *not having much to look after besides you*, could not demand the same measure of wealth, honour, and dominion; because he could use upon you and your little family but a small pittance of what pertains to one moving in a wider and more exalted sphere.

'*Nelly.* But do you mean to say, Abby, that if I am not married according to God's order before the resurrection, that I shall always have to remain single, and also be your servant, or the servant of some one that is married according to that order?

'*Abby.* That is what God has most clearly revealed in many scriptures.'

This contingent Queenship, however, will be subject to the husband's appointment, and the reversionary interest therein often creates rivalry in the establishment. Mr. Gunnison was

informed at Salt Lake that Brigham Young had a wife who died before she became a Mormon, but has since been saved by vicarious baptism, and that the first of his present wives frequently teazes her husband by inquiring whether she herself or her predecessor will be his Queen in the world to come. (*G.* 77.)

Besides the arguments above mentioned in favour of polygamy, derived from Revelation, others are deduced from reason and expediency. The chief of these is, that the Oriental system will remedy the immorality in which Europe is now sunk. So corrupt is society at present, especially in England, that not only are there 'a hundred thousand prostitutes in 'London,' but also that the 'haunts of vice' are constantly frequented by those who are specially ordained to be the guardians of public morality, by 'parsons, and *even bishops in disguise.*' (*XV.* 244.) This foul and wide-spread pollution would be cured by polygamy, for under that institution no female would be driven to vice by the want of a legitimate protector. 'Don't 'you think,' says Nelly, in the tract before cited, 'that the 'hundred thousand unfortunate females of London would much 'rather have such husbands [*i. e.* husbands shared with several 'other wives] than lead out their present miserable short lives 'as they do?'

Again, it is urged that the 'Patriarchal Order' will soon be rendered necessary by an excess of females over males, which is to result from the destructive wars now impending over the world. A passage in Isaiah is interpreted as prophesying that this excess will be in the proportion of seven to one.

Farther, the system of plurality is desirable as rewarding good men and punishing bad men, for the good will be selected as husbands by many wives, while the bad will be accepted by none. 'How many virtuous females,' says Chancellor Spencer, 'would prefer to *unite* their destinies to one and the same 'honourable and virtuous man, rather than to *separate* their 'destinies each to an inferior vicious man? Shall such virtuous 'and innocent females be denied the right to choose the objects 'of their love?' (*P. O.* 2.)

Moreover, far from causing discord among women, this patriarchal institution 'is calculated to dispel jealousy.'

'For instance, in this country three young women all love the same young man. Being rivals, it is natural that they should hate each other in exact proportion as they love the young man; because they know that the law will not allow him to be married to them all. If polygamy were allowed, this jealousy would not exist, because a woman would know that she could be married to any man she loved.' (*XV.* 660.)

Another argument much insisted on is the removal of an impediment which now hinders the conversion of polygamous heathen. This is illustrated by the following story, which we find constantly repeated in the 'Mormon Apologies:'—

'A Dakotah Indian offered himself for baptism to some Presbyterian missionaries. On being questioned he said, that he had several wives. He was told that he could not be baptized while he had more wives than one. The heathen went away, and returned in a few months renewing his request. He was again questioned how many wives he had. *One only*, said he. "*What had he done with all the others?*" *I have eaten them*, was the reply.' (*XV.* 147.)

From the tone taken by the Mormon advocates of polygamy, it would seem as if the practice must prevail among them extensively. For, otherwise, we cannot understand why they should represent it to the poor in their popular tracts as a state so desirable, that a man with only one wife must be precluded from the higher degrees of happiness in the life to come. Yet, on the other hand, it is hard to conceive how any but the wealthier members of the community can indulge in so expensive a luxury. However this may be, it is certain from the evidence of such credible witnesses as Captain Stansbury and Lieutenant Gunnison, that the great officers of the Church maintain seraglios on a scale truly Oriental. The latter informs us (p. 120.) that the three members of the Presidency had, when he was in Utah, no less than eighty-two wives between them, and that one of the three 'was called an old bachelor, 'because he had only a baker's dozen.' And Captain Stansbury describes the '*numerous family*' of the President as mingling freely in the balls, parties, and other social amusements of the place.

The delightful effects of this practice on the domestic felicity of Utah are thus described by one of the organs of Mormonism:—

'Each wife knows that the other wives are as much entitled to the attention of the husband as she herself; she knows that such attentions are not criminal, therefore she does not lose confidence in him; though she may consider him partial, in some respects, yet she has the consolation to know that his attentions towards them are strictly virtuous. (*Seer*, i. 125.)

'There is no particular rule as regards the residence of *the different branches of a family.* It is very frequently the case that they all reside in the same dwelling, and take hold unitedly, with the greatest cheerfulness, of the different branches of household or domestic business; eating at the same table, and kindly looking after each others' welfare, while the greatest peace and harmony prevail

year after year. Their children play and associate together with the greatest affection as brothers and sisters, *while each mother apparently manifests as much kindness and tender regard for the children of the others as for her own.*' (*Seer*, i. 42.)

This last result of the system is so unquestionably miraculous, that it is almost sufficient of itself to convert an unbelieving world. Notwithstanding such evidence, however, the Gentile Gunnison presumes to speak unfavourably of the effects of this sacred ordinance. He thinks that it leads to the depression of women, and tells us that they are disrespectfully treated by the 'saints,' as an inferior order of beings:—

'Gentile gallantry,' (says he), 'is declared by the Mormons to have reversed the natural position of the sexes. To give the post of honour or of comfort to the lady is absurd. If there is but one seat they say it of right belongs to the gentleman, and it is the duty and place of a man to lead the way, and let his fair partner enter the room behind him.' (*G.* 157.)

He also speaks of polygamy as 'the great cause of disruption 'in families,' and affirms that the children are 'the most lawless 'and profane of all that have come under his observation.'

We have already spoken of the legal and political consequences which may probably arise from this custom. We may add, that it can scarcely fail to contain the seeds of internal discontent. For the industrious inhabitants of Utah must find out before long that by the toil of their own sinews they are maintaining the sumptuous harems of their chiefs. Nor is it possible that in a new colony the female population can be sufficiently abundant to allow this Eastern luxury to the powerful without compelling many of the poor to remain unwedded. Already, indeed, one of the toasts at a recent public dinner in Utah—'*Wanted immediately more ladies!*'—seems to indicate dissatisfaction.

We cannot leave this part of our subject without mentioning that a graver charge than that of polygamy has been brought against the Mormon leaders. The depositions published by their opponents at Nauvoo accused them, not of openly adding to their domestic establishment, but of secretly corrupting female virtue, under the pretext of *spiritual marriage*. An affidavit made by one Martha Brotherton details very circumstantially an attempt made by Brigham Young to seduce her under this pretence. We are inclined to believe her statement, because she explicitly refers to Joseph's 'new revelation,' which was at that time carefully concealed from all but the initiated. Nor are there wanting intimations in the documents already published by the Church that something more is behind.

Thus the first revelation on polygamy concludes with the following promise: 'As pertaining unto this law, verily I say unto 'you, *I will reveal more unto you hereafter.*' (*XV.* 8.) And so we read in the 'Star' (*XV.* 91.), 'Ours is a *progressive* system, 'and we must progress with it, or be left behind. If you are 'found obedient to counsel, nothing will stumble you, neither '*spiritual wifeism,* nor anything else.'

Nevertheless, if such secret privileges are permitted to the Mormon chiefs, they must be used with extreme caution. Even the sacred character of an Apostle would hardly save him from the vengeance of an injured husband, accustomed to the summary proceedings of Lynchian jurisprudence. Last year a Mormon of the name of Egan was brought to trial for murdering the seducer of his wife, and (though admitting the fact) was acquitted by a Utah jury. Nor, whatever may be the character of the leaders, can we hesitate to believe the almost unanimous testimony of travellers to the general morality of the population. Indeed, the laborious and successful industry which we have described could not characterise a debauched and licentious people.

We have dwelt at some length on the Mormon polygamy, not only on account of its intrinsic importance, but because its disclosure is so recent that previous writers have been unable to give accurate information on the subject. The ethical teaching of the sect is not distinguished by any other very remarkable peculiarity. The chief duty impressed upon the saints is the punctual payment of their tithes. We can scarcely open a page of their official publications without finding strenuous exhortation to the fulfilment of that indispensable obligation. Next to this cardinal virtue, they seem to rate the merit of abstinence from fermented liquors and tobacco. This, however, is not absolutely insisted on, but only urged as a 'precept of 'wisdom.' It was enforced by Joseph, whose practice did not square with his precepts, as he was often drunk himself. But his sagacity perceived that the money squandered by his disciples on gin and cigars must be diverted from the treasury of the Church.

The virtue of patriotism is also a frequent theme of Mormon eulogy. By publicly enjoining it, they endeavour to refute the charges of treason so often brought against them by their enemies. Hence the anniversary of the 4th of July (the birthday of American independence) is celebrated with special jubilation in the city of Salt Lake, and the tree of liberty is duly refreshed with torrents of rhetoric, and also with more material libations. The official list of toasts given at one of the last of these festivities, shows that the citizens cling with equal

attachment to the 'domestic institutions' of Virginia and of Deseret; for the 12th toast is *Slavery*, and the 13th *Polygamy*.* The 15th, which, we suppose, is meant to point the moral of the other two, is "THE GREAT NATIONAL MOTTO,— '*Do unto others as you would have others do unto you.*'

Such festive meetings, which are very frequent, generally conclude with dancing, an exercise, the practice of which must be also included in the ethical system of Mormonism. In saltatorial, as in military movements, the priesthood occupy the foremost place. The president leads off, and bishops, patriarchs, and elders are to be seen figuring enthusiastically, 'not,' says Colonel Kane, 'in your minuets or other mortuary 'processions of Gentles, but in jigs and reels.' When the temple is completed, these public dances are to form a part of the regular worship.

But the most remarkable feature in the practical working of Mormonism, considered as a Religion, is the almost entire absence of the *devotional* element. In the addresses of its teachers, we find no exhortation to the duties of private prayer, of self-examination, or of penitence. In their writings we can trace no aspirations after communion with God, after spirituality of mind, after purification of the affections. All is 'of the 'earth, earthy.' One of the ablest writers against Christianity has lately stated it as his chief objection to the Christian System, that it discourages the love of earthly things, and requires its votaries to set their affections on things above. He proposes to amend the precept of Saint John,—'Love not 'the world, neither the things that are in the world; the lust 'of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life,' by simply leaving out the word *not*. Mormonism seems exactly to realise the ideal of this distinguished controversialist; and, as he does not mention it as one of the phases through which his faith has hitherto passed, we cannot but hope that he may still find among the *Latter Day Saints* that resting-place which he tells us that he vainly sought among the *Craig-and-Mullerites*.

This mundane character of Mormonism faithfully perpetuates the type impressed on it by its founder. Joseph Smith was 'a jolly fellow,' says one of his admirers, and not in the least *methodistical*. 'His was a laughter-loving, cheerful religion,'

* The 13th toast is printed as follows: 'Poly-Ticks and Poly-'Gamy;' a piece of wit which seems to have been highly appreciated. (*XIV.* 566.) With regard to slavery, it should be observed that according to Joseph's revelations, the negroes are of an inferior race, and that no person of colour can be admitted into the Church. (*XIV.* 472.)

says Mr. Gunnison. The General Epistles of the "Church" exemplify the same peculiarity. The Gospel which they proclaim consists of directions for emigration, instructions for the setting up of machinery, the management of iron-works, the manufacture of nails, the spinning of cotton-yarn, and the breeding of stock. The same undevotional aspect is exhibited by their public worship, at least in Utah; for in Europe reserve is used, and their practice assimilated to that of other sects. The service begins with instrumental music, the band performing 'anthems, marches, and *waltzes;*' 'which,' says Mr. Gunnison eulogistically, 'drives away all sombre feelings.' An extempore prayer follows, which invokes blessings on the president, officers, and members of the Church, and curses upon their enemies. Then comes a discussion, in which any one may speak. This part of the service is usually a conversation on local business, like that in an English vestry meeting. The sermon follows; but even that is not confined to religious exhortation, but embraces such questions as the discipline of the Legion, the Californian gold-digging, and the politics of the Territory. The most curious specimen of these discourses which we have discovered is the following, which we take from the official report: —

'Elder George Smith was called upon to preach an iron sermon. He rose, and took into the stand [pulpit] one of the fire-irons [the first productions of the Utah founderies]. Holding the same over his head, he cried out "*Stereotype edition,*" and descended amid the cheers of the saints. The choir then sung the doxology, and the benediction was pronounced by Lorenzo Snow.' (*XV.* 492.)

This kind of religious service would satisfy the aspirations of Mr. Carlyle himself, whose rather lengthy sermons on the text *laborare est orare* are thus condensed into pantomime by 'Elder 'George Smith.'

The Mormon collection of hymns, which we have mentioned at the head of this Article, might lead to an impression of the religion different from that which we have here given. But when we come to examine it, we find, in the first place, that it is published for the English congregations; and, secondly, that nine-tenths of the hymns (including all which possess the slightest merit, devotional or poetical) are stolen from the collections in use among English Protestants, especially from the Wesleyan hymn-book. The few original compositions which Mormonism has produced are execrable, both in taste and feeling. In addition to the samples which we have already given, we may add the following: —

JOSEPH'S APOTHEOSIS.

(Air.—'*The sea! The sea! The open sea!*')

'He's free! He's free! The Prophet's free!
He is where he will ever be.
His home's in the sky; he dwells with *the Gods;*
Far from the furious rage of mobs.
He died, he died, for those he loved.
He reigns, he reigns, in the realms above.'

(*Hymns*, 338.)

---

SAME SUBJECT.

'Hail to the Prophet ascended to heaven,
Traitors and tyrants now fight him in vain;
Mingling *with Gods* he can plan for his brethren;
Death cannot conquer the hero again.

'Praise to his memory! he died as a martyr!
Honoured and blest be his ever great name!
Long shall his blood, which was shed by assassins,
Stain Illinois, while the earth lauds his fame.

'Sacrifice brings forth the blessings of heaven,
Earth must atone for the blood of that man;
Wake up the world for the conflict of justice,
Millions shall know brother Joseph again.'

(*Ibid.* 325.)

---

THE DEEDS OF JOSEPH.

'Who took the plates the angel showed?
And brought them from their dark abode?
And made them plain by power of God?
The prophet Joseph Smith.

'Who did receive the power to raise
The Church of Christ in latter days?
And call on men to mend their ways?
The prophet Joseph Smith.

'Who bore the scorn, the rage, the ire,
Of those who preach for filthy hire?
Was called by them impostor, liar?
The prophet Joseph Smith.'

(*XIV.* 304.)

We must not forget that the whole fabric which we have hitherto described, both doctrinal, ethical, and liturgical, might be changed at once by a new revelation uttered by the president of the Church. The only limitation to his power is the necessity of securing the assent of his followers, which, though not theoretically essential, is practically indispensable.

Loss of popularity must of necessity entail dethronement. We have already observed the skill with which the Mormon hierarchy is constructed, so as to enlist in its service all the available talent of the sect, and thus to guard as far as possible against the danger of rebellion. We need not recapitulate the long list of names by which its various grades are designated. The quaintness of some of these gives, at first sight, an air of ridicule to the whole; but, however ludicrous the nomenclature, the organisation itself is too skilful to be ridiculous. The supreme authority is nominally in '*the Presidency*,' which consists of the President and his two Councillors. But, in reality, the First President is sole monarch, for his assessors, though they may remonstrate, have no power of resisting his decrees. The President himself, according to Smith's statement (*XV.* 13.) is '*appointed* by revelation,' and '*acknowledged* by the voice of 'the Church.' But Brigham Young has modified this declaration, by announcing that, although constituted a *Prophet* by revelation, he holds the office of *President* by the choice of the people (*XV.* 488.). And, in fact, a vote *that he be sustained in his office* is passed at every General Conference. It would seem, therefore, to be theoretically possible that the divinely-appointed 'Seer, Prophet, and Revelator,' might be deposed by the Church. But the exact limits which define the powers of President and Conference are left as indeterminate as in the similar case of Pope and General Council. Another change effected under the administration of Young has been, the assumption by the Apostolic College of a paramount authority unknown to the original constitution. Many of the apostles, however, are generally absent from head-quarters on missionary journeys, and the acting senate is a council of twelve, selected from among the high priests. The *Bishops* are financial officers, employed in the collection of the tithe. The *Patriarchs* are charged with the special function of pronouncing benedictions on individuals. Joseph Smith, senior, the Prophet's father, was formerly Patriarch, and, even in the early days of Mormon poverty, received for this service ten dollars a week (more than 100*l.* a year), and 'his expenses found.' (*XV.* 308.) The present chief Patriarch (John Smith, an uncle of Joseph's,) no doubt gets better pay, and we see that the unhappy old man has lately published a solemn affirmation of the truth of his nephew's miracles. (*XIV.* 97.)

In subordination to these higher officers is a great variety of minor functionaries, each of whom, from the lowest to the highest, has a direct interest in strengthening the hierarchical government, in which he holds a place, and by which he may

mount, as his present superiors have mounted, from poverty to wealth, and from contempt to power. Thus all work zealously together in maintaining ecclesiastical discipline, and (to use the words of one of them) enforce upon the people '*the importance* '*of being governed by the Priesthood in all things.*' (*XIV.* 294.)

But whatever may be the merits of such an organisation, its success must depend in great measure on the character of its Head. The Jesuits would never have reconquered Europe for the Pope, had not the first three or four generals of the Order been men of eminent ability. Mormonism would probably have perished after the death of Smith, had the Apostles shown less sagacity in their selection of their present chief. Brigham Young was the son of a farmer in the Eastern States (*XV.* 642.), and was brought up to the trade of a carpenter. He joined the sect early, and rose to eminence by his serviceable obedience. He is a man of action, not of speculation; distinguished for coarse strength and toughness, physical and moral; and these qualities have been needed for the rough work he has had to do. His first important charge was the mission to England in 1837, when he founded the British Churches. Shortly before that epoch, he was solemnly set apart 'to go forth from land to land, 'and from sea to sea.' And we read that 'the blessing of 'Brigham Young was that he should be *strong in body*, that he 'might go forth and gather the elect.' (*Smith's Autob. XV.* 206.) We have related how, after the death of Smith, he supplanted Rigdon, and rose from the chairmanship of the Apostles to the Presidency, and how wisely he led his followers through the wilderness, and planted them in the land of promise. By his appointment as Governor of the territory of Utah, his character received the stamp of public approbation from the supreme Government of the United States; whence he reaped also the solid advantage of a salary of 2500 dollars. Besides this official income, he has the uncontrolled management of the ecclesiastical revenues, including the tithing of his subjects, foreign and domestic. We learn, therefore, without surprise, that he has acquired considerable property, and that he is able not only to maintain a suitable establishment and 'princely 'carriages' (*G.* 63.), but also to support a family of forty wives and about a hundred children. His prosperity has excited some jealousy among his people; and we find him, in a recent speech, remonstrating with those who 'complain of *me* living 'upon tithing.' (*XV.* 161.) But hitherto he has succeeded in suppressing such murmurs by his frank and popular bearing, and by the proofs he has given of indefatigable zeal for the public interest. The official documents which he publishes

from time to time, and especially his Messages to the local Legislature, show the illiterate sagacity of the *Rusticus abnormis sapiens*, and exhibit a curious mixture of business-like statement with Yankee bombast. As a specimen of the latter, we may take the following description of the Abolitionist party, from a recent message: —

'The fanatical bigot, with the spirit of northern supremacy, seeks to enwrap in sacrilegious flame the altar of his country's liberties, offering an unholy sacrifice which, arising in encircling wreaths of dark and turbid columns, emitting in fitful glare the burning lava, betokens erewhile her consummation.' (*XV.* 422.)

When opposed, the President is apt to become overbearing and scurrilous. Thus, in his controversy with Judge Brocchus, he tells his correspondent that he is 'either profoundly ignorant 'or wilfully wicked — one of the two.' 'You manifest a choice,' he adds, 'to leave an incensed public in incense [*sic*] still.' And farther: —

'When the spirit of persecution manifests itself in the flippancy of rhetoric for female insult and desecration, it is time that I forbear to hold my peace, lest the thundering anathemas of nations born and unborn, should rest upon my head, when the marrow of my bones shall be illy [*sic*] prepared to sustain the threatened blow. (*XIV.* 402.)

Yet the President can write better than this, when he restricts himself to less ambitious prose. His correspondence with Dr. Adams, for example (*Ibid.* 213.), is a model of shrewd sense, not unmixed with a touch of humour, and shows that he is well able to detect an impostor. This, indeed, is not surprising, on the principle of that ancient rule which prescribes the agents most serviceable in thief-catching.

Next to the President in importance, though not in official rank, stands the apostle Orson Pratt. As Young in action, so Pratt in speculation, is the leader of the sect. Like so many intelligent and half-educated men, he has greedily received the teaching of the modern Pantheistic philosophy, from its popular interpreters, American and English. From such sources he has compounded that strange jumble of incongruous dogmas which we have before attempted to describe. Thus he probably hopes to enlist some recruits from the party of 'Young America,' who may be induced to swallow the absurdities of Mormonism in a non-natural sense, washed down with a lubricating dose of mysticism. He has himself substantial reasons for his allegiance to the cause. He holds the pleasantest appointment which his Church can bestow upon an intelligent man — being its resident

agent at Washington. His official duty (according to the tenor of his diploma) is 'to write and publish periodicals and books 'illustrative of the principles and doctrines of the Church;' and it is his prerogative 'to receive and collect tithing of the 'saints throughout all his field of labour.' (*XV.* 42.)

His elder brother, Parley Pratt, though individually less prominent than Orson, represents an element of Mormonism far more essential to its success. He may be considered as chief of the Mormon missionaries. The zeal and activity of these emissaries, though it has been much exaggerated, is still remarkable. The Governors of the sect are good judges of character; and it is their plan to select the restless and enterprising spirits, who, perhaps, may threaten disturbance at home, and to utilise their fanaticism, while they flatter their vanity, by sending them as representatives of the Church to distant fields of labour. Their method of establishing a mission in a foreign country is as follows. Amongst their converts, taken at random from the mixed population of the Union, there are natives to be found of every nation in Europe. They select a native of the country which they wish to attack, and join him as interpreter to the other emissaries whom they are about to despatch to the land of his birth. On arriving at their destination, the missionaries are supported by the funds of the Church, till they can maintain themselves out of the offerings of their proselytes. Meanwhile, they employ themselves in learning the language, and circulating tracts in defence of their creed; and then sit down to the weary task of translating the 'Book of Mormon.'

By this process, they have formed churches in Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Iceland, France, Germany, Italy, Switzerland, Malta, Gibraltar, Hindostan, Australia, and the Sandwich Islands; and besides these, they have recently sent missionaries to Siam, Ceylon, China, the West Indies, Guiana, and Chili. The 'Book of Mormon' has been published in French, German, Italian, Danish, Polynesian, and Welsh. Besides various tracts which are circulated by these missionaries, they have established regular periodicals in French, Welsh, and Danish.* We should observe, however, that of the missions above enumerated, the first and last (those to Denmark and the Sandwich Islands) have alone been really successful. In Denmark, at the beginning of 1853, they possessed 1400 baptized converts, and had also despatched 297 more to Utah. In the Sandwich Islands they

* Namely, 'Le Reflecteur,' published monthly, at Lausanne; the 'Udgorn Seion,' weekly, at Merthyr; and the 'Skandinaviens 'Sterne,' twice a month, at Copenhagen.

had baptized 589, before their mission had been established twelve months. These proselytes were all previously Christians, converted from heathenism by American missionaries. The other foreign missions have as yet only succeeded in making a very small number of proselytes. The accounts published by their founders are often exceedingly absurd. Among the most grotesque is the record of the Italian mission, by the apostle, Lorenzo Snow. He begins by informing us that he sailed from Southampton to a place called '*Avre de grace.*' In due time he reached the valleys of the Waldenses, 'who have received many 'privile*d*ges from the Sardinian Government.' With him were three other Mormons — the first, an Americo-Sicilian; the second, an Englishman; and the third, a Scotchman. The four met on a hill in Piedmont, which they named *Mount Brigham.* They record their proceedings in the style of a Yankee public meeting, as follows: —

'*Moved by Elder Snow* — That the Church of Latter Day Saints be now organised in Italy. *Seconded and carried.*

'*Moved by Elder Stenhouse* — That Elder Snow, of the quorum of twelve apostles, be sustained President of the Church in Italy. *Seconded and carried.*

'*Moved by Elder Snow* — That Elder Stenhouse be Secretary of the Church in Italy. *Seconded and carried.*

Thus was formed the 'Church of Italy,' which contained at the time of its formation not a single Italian member. Its founders boast, however, that they have contrived to deceive the Roman Catholic authorities, by publishing a Tract under the title of 'The Voice of Joseph,' with a woodcut of a Nun for frontispiece, and a vignette of the Cross upon the title-page. Under these false colours, they hope soon to win their way.

But Great Britain is the true theatre of Mormon triumph. An official census is published half-yearly, whence we learn that in July 1853, the British Saints amounted to 30,690, and contained 40 '*Seventies*,' 10 *High Priests*, 2578 *Elders*, 1854 *Priests*, 1416 *Teachers*, and 834 *Deacons*.* Thus one-fifth of

* The most numerous Church in England is that of Manchester, which contains 3166 members; the next is that of Glamorganshire, which contains 2338, mostly at Merthyr. In the very valuable and authentic Report on religious worship by Mr. Horace Mann, which has lately appeared under the auspices of Mr. Graham, the Registrar General, as superintendent of the Census, there is an account of the Mormons, p. cvi.—cxii., from which we extract the following passage:—'In England and Wales there were, in 1851, reported by the 'Census officers, as many as 222 places of worship belonging to this

the whole number are invested with some official function. We may add, that 25,000 copies of the 'Millennial Star,' the Mormon organ, are sold weekly.

To explain the causes of this success, gained by the preachers of a superstition so preposterous, is a most important part of our task. Yet it needs no long investigation, for these causes are not difficult to detect. In the first place, it may be laid down as an axiom that every impostor may at once obtain a body of disciples large enough to form the nucleus of a sect, provided he be endowed with sufficient impudence. This is true not only of religious empirics, but of all speculators on human credulity. What quack ever failed to sell his pills, if he mixed them with the proper quantum of mendacity? The homœopathist, the spirit-rapper, and the phrenologist, each attracts his clique of believers. All this is only an illustration of the Hudibrastic maxim,—

> 'Because the pleasure is as great
> In being cheated as to cheat.'

In religion, Joseph Smith has had many predecessors, no less successful than himself. The German Anabaptists, who resembled him both in their pretensions to inspiration, and in their practice of polygamy, held temporary sway over cities larger than Nauvoo. Not many years are past since Joanna Southcote persuaded thousands to accept her as a New Messiah. Nay, even now, the *Agapemone* of Bridgwater is full of crazy fanatics, who maintain an impostor, more blasphemous than Brigham, in a state as princely as that of the President of Utah. The weakness of credulity in some, the strength of madness in others, ensures to every fraudulent pretender the

---

'body: most of them, however, being merely rooms. The number of 'sittings in these places (making an allowance for 53, the accommo- 'dation in which was not returned) was 30,783. The attendance on 'the Census Sunday (making an estimated addition for 9 chapels, 'from which no intelligence on this point was received) was: Morn- 'ing, 7,517; Afternoon, 11,481; Evening, 16,628. The preachers, it 'appears, are far from unsuccessful in their efforts to obtain disciples: 'the surprising confidence and zeal with which they promulgate their 'creed, the prominence they give to the exciting topics of the speedy 'coming of the Saviour, and his personal millennial reign, and the 'attractiveness to many minds of the idea of an infallible church, 'relying for its evidences and its guidance upon revelations made 'perpetually to its rulers, these, with other influences, have combined 'to give the Mormon movement a position and importance with the 'working classes, which, perhaps, should draw to it much more than 'it has yet received of the attention of our public teachers.'

fulcrum which he needs. The latter cause, indeed, has no doubt contributed the corner-stone to many Mormon churches besides that of Hamburg; the founder of which ingenuously confesses, 'the woman whom I baptized first here was in the 'madhouse for a long time. She was possessed by an evil 'spirit for fourteen years.'

Thus a heap of materials lies ever ready for the torch of the religious incendiary. But in general the straw and stubble burns out as quickly as it kindles; and even if a few ashes continue to smoulder (as, for instance, there are still a few Southcotians), yet the flame has died away. But Mormonism has already outlived this ephemeral stage of sectarian existence, and, after twenty years of growth, is now more vigorous than ever. The first and most important cause of its permanent power, is its claim to possess a living prophet and a continuous inspiration. Its votaries tell us that they are not left, like other men, in anxious uncertainty, but are guided in every step by the audible voice and visible hand of God. In every age there are multitudes who would gladly suffer the moral problems of life to be solved for them by an outward authority. And an age remarkable for religious earnestness will be especially exposed to the seductions of those who pretend to reveal to it with definite accuracy the will of Heaven. The most conspicuous example of this in our days has been the conversion of so many truth-seeking men to the Church of Rome. We have all heard their enthusiastic description of their present happiness contrasted with their former distress. Once they were compelled to grope their way in darkness, or only lighted by the dim lamp of duty, and the disputed precepts of Scripture. Now they have emerged into the clear sunshine of heavenly day, and have only to obey, at every turn, the voice which cries so clearly, '*this is the way, walk ye in it.*' But these converts have been chiefly confined to the higher classes. Englishmen in the lower and less educated ranks are seldom allured to the Church of Rome; being repelled from it by a feeling of its anti-national character, and by the appearance of idolatry in its ceremonial. The bold pretensions of a Protestant sect to more than Roman infallibility, satisfy their longing for religious certainty, without shocking their hereditary instincts. The power of such an attraction is proved by the fact that even the Irvingite Church still possesses congregations in many large towns, although its claims to miraculous gifts have become faint and hesitating, and its members are not proselytising fanatics, but quiet and unobtrusive dreamers. The Mormonites are of a very different temper. Eager and impatient to pro-

pagate their sect, peremptory in their demand of obedience, unscrupulous in their assertions, and unhesitatingly promising absolute assurance to their proselytes. By their revelations, their miracles, and their prophecies, faith is changed into sight. So their organ tells us —

'Latter Day Saints KNOW that the Lord has spoken in this age. Thay KNOW that angels do now converse with men. They KNOW that the gifts of the Holy Ghost are manifested in these days by dreams, visions, revelations, tongues, prophecies, miracles, healings. Latter Day Saints have come to a KNOWLEDGE of the truth.' (*XIV.* 444.)

Secondly, the success of Mormonism is due to its organisation, which has enabled it to employ the obedience of its votaries to the best advantage. The submission rendered to a voice which men believe divine, supplies a motive force of unlimited power; and when this is applied by well-constructed machinery, the results which may be effected are almost incalculable. When the energies of masses are directed by a single mind, wonders will be accomplished, even though (as often happens in military achievements) the service is rendered with sullen indifference or extorted by compulsion. But when the obedience is the obedience of the will, and when the unity of action is blended with a unity of heart and purpose, the results of such a concentration of moral force upon any given point are not more really surprising than the raising of the Menai bridge by the hydrostatic paradox.

Thirdly, we may attribute the welcome which Mormonism has met from our working classes to the prevalence of discontent among the poor against the rich. The repinings of labour against capital, which have covered England with strikes and Europe with barricades, are at once sanctioned and consoled by the missionaries of the 'Saints.' They invite their hearers to fly from oppression to that happy land where the poor are lords of the soil, where no cruel millowners can trample on the 'rights 'of labour,' where social inequalities are unknown, and where all the citizens are united by the bonds of a universal brotherhood and a common faith. In the minutes of a recent 'General 'Conference' we read that 'Elder Taylor related a conversa-'tion which he had held with a French Communist, wherein he 'proved that the Saints have done all which the French Com-'munists have failed to establish.' (*XV.* 389.) And certainly they may appeal with just pride to the contrast presented by Nauvoo in its decay with the flourishing city which they abandoned. For M. Cabet's Socialists (its present possessors) have been unable even to preserve from ruin the farms and

workshops which Mormon industry had left ready to their hands. To such promises of substantial comfort these skilful propagandists add glowing pictures of the millennial glories which are soon to dawn on 'Zion'; gratifying, yet surpassing, the aspirations after a 'good time coming,' which fill the dreams of their democratic converts.

Another, and perhaps not the least influental, aid to Mormon proselytism, is the adaptation of their materialising theology to the system taught by the extreme section of popular Protestantism. That Judaizing spirit which would supersede the New Testament by the Old; which imposes Mosaic ordinances as Christian laws; which turns even the new dispensation into a string of verbal shibboleths*; prepares the mind for the corresponding dogmas of Mormonism. But while the Mormon teachers fall in with this popular system, they carry out its carnal views to a more logical development. Thus they have pushed its Judaizing tendencies (as we have seen) into actual Judaism. And even while discarding the morality of the New Testament, they found their hierarchy on the most servile adherence to its letter; and maintain that any departure from its nomenclature in the designations of ecclesiastical officers is indefensible. It is instructive to observe how easily this formalism, which is usually regarded as preeminently Protestant, blends with their Romanising attribution of a magic power to outward rites, an inherent sanctity to earthly temples, and an efficacious virtue to offerings for the dead; for, in truth, these several modes of substituting a formal for a spiritual religion, whether patronised by Pope or Presbyter, are only diverse manifestations of the same idolatrous superstition.

Such are the principal causes which explain the rapid growth of this singular sect. But we do not believe them sufficient to secure its permanent stability; for, in the first place, when the necessity for increasing the population of Utah has passed away, the zeal for proselytism which it has bred must burn less warmly. Secondly, that agglomeration of the sect upon a single spot, which, up to a certain point, gives strength and centralisation, contains also an element of weakness; for it makes the Church of Mormon local instead of catholic, and tends to restrict the converts to that small number who intend to emigrate. Thirdly, the success of the leaders in rendering the

* We have often regretted that Coleridge should have applied Lessing's term of *Bibliolatry* (a word sure to be misrepresented) to this tendency of popular religionism. *Grammatolatry* would have been a better word for that against which St. Paul protests as ἡ διακονία τοῦ γράμματος.

government of Utah theocratic may ultimately prove suicidal. At present the democracy is merged in the theocracy. Even the members of the Legislature, nominally elected by universal suffrage, are really named by the President, and returned without a contest. But this very blending of the two elements of sovereignty tends to confound the one with the other. By a gradual change in the public sentiment, the Church might be swallowed up in the State; the forms might remain while the spirit was extinct; the hierarchy of Apostles and Elders might continue nominally supreme, but might become a body of mere civil functionaries; for it will be remembered that every ecclesiastical appointment is at present submitted twice a year to a popular vote. Thus even the office of President itself might, without any revolutionary change, pass quietly into an elective magistracy. Again, there is a possibility of disruption upon the death of every President. It may not always happen, as after Smith's murder, that the whole Church will support a single candidate. And (as we have already shown) the rules which fix the mode of appointment are contradictory. Lastly, we are told by those who have resided in Utah, that the younger citizens do not inherit the faith of their fathers.* A race is growing up which laughs at the plates and prophecies of Joseph. This is the symptom of a natural reaction; the credulity of one generation followed by the scepticism of the next. Meanwhile, as wealth increases, so will instruction and intelligence; and since no educated man can really believe the silly fables of Mormonism, and only a small minority can be bribed to profess a faith which they do not feel, the unbelief of the more enlightened must ultimately descend to the masses. When this happens, the theocracy must be violently broken up; unless it should be peaceably metamorphosed (as we have supposed above) into a form of civil government.

In such a case, the residuary religion of Mormonism would probably take its place among Christian sects, alongside of Swedenborgianism and Irvingism. It would easily rid itself of its more Antichristian features, by the issue of new revelations, which should supersede those of Rigdon and Brigham. The abandonment of polygamy would do less violence to the system than its introduction; for it was originally forbidden; and its subsequent permission might be explained as a temporary privilege, granted to the saints, martyrs, and apostles, who suffered and bled for the faith. The book of 'Doctrines and Covenants' is mostly of so ephemeral a character, that it might easily be

* *G.* 160.

suffered to drop into oblivion. Thus a belief in the Book of Mormon might be left, as the only distinctive symbol of the sect; a belief which would not more affect their practice than if they believed in the history of Jack the Giant Killer.

But the decline of Mormonism which we anticipate is only matter of conjecture, — its rise and progress is matter of fact. Nor ought we to neglect the lessons taught by its success. In the first place, we may learn not to expect too much from the extension of popular education. Two-thirds of the Mormon converts are men who have gained all which it is possible for the ordinary routine of primary instruction to bestow upon the mass of the working classes in the few years during which they can be left at school. This is no reason for relaxing in our efforts to advance the civilisation of the poor. On the contrary, it is a great reason for superadding some machinery which may attract their youth to those fountains of which their childhood can barely taste.* Yet even when the most is done that can be done, we must not expect too high a standard of attainment. The information gained by tired workmen in the hours of relaxation must needs be somewhat loose and smattering, except in the case of the most powerful intellects.

Another lesson forced on us by the success of Mormonism, especially concerns the teachers of religion. Many victims of this miserable imposture might have been saved had our popular preachers taught their hearers to draw the line of separation clearly between the religion of the New Testament and that of the Old. But on this point we have already said enough in the foregoing pages.

Finally, if it be humiliating to confess that this fanatical superstition has made more dupes in England than in all the world besides; yet the instrumentality by which they have been gained also contains matter of encouragement. The same principle of organisation which has been so powerful in the cause of

---

* One of the best means is by establishing *free libraries*, such as have been instituted in Liverpool, Manchester, and elsewhere, under a recent Act. But if they are to do good, these establishments should be careful not to circulate books likely to corrupt the morals of the people. The First Report of the Manchester library gives a list of the books most frequently read; and at the head of all we find 'Roderick Random'! We cannot see the necessity of gratuitously supplying the population with a book which (if we may venture to alter a phrase of Johnson's) combines the morals of a pimp with the manners of a scavenger. Lord Campbell, the other day, in sentencing a seller of obscene books to imprisonment, observed with a noble indignation, that the crime was greater than that of a poisoner.

error, might do good service to the cause of truth. Amongst the Mormons, as we have seen, one in five participates in the ecclesiastical government. Let us suppose that, in like manner, the religious laity of the Church of England were invested with official functions. Let us suppose that they were made to feel themselves members of a living body; essential parties to its acts; sharers in its responsibilities; doers of the Word, and not hearers only. Surely if, among the millions who worship in our churches, we will not say one in five, but even one in fifty, were thus animated to exertion, their achievements in rescuing their countrymen from the slavery of ignorance and vice might at least redeem the future, if they could not remedy the past. Meanwhile, if the great national institution of the church seem to fall short of its high calling, and to do but half its task, we may console ourselves with the recollection that it works in fetters, and that vital circulation may yet be restored to organs frozen by a forced inaction. For it can never be more difficult to loose than to bind; and though it might be impossible to create, it is easy to emancipate.

---

ART. II.— *The Works of John Locke.* In Nine Volumes, 8vo. London.

PROBABLY no philosopher of our own country—hardly any of any country—has exerted a more extensive or durable influence over the intellectual world than our illustrious countryman, John Locke. This is not owing, certainly, to the universal acceptance of all the dogmas he maintained, or to any lack of doubts and disputes as to what, on many points, *were* his dogmas. On the contrary, the criticism which has been expended on even the fundamental principles of his metaphysical theory would, as Judge Jeffreys said of the voluminous writings of Richard Baxter, 'fill a cart.'

Yet Locke has enjoyed his protracted and extensive empire not without sufficient reason. Not only has he extracted as ample a treasure of the ore of TRUTH from the mine as could fairly be expected from the efforts of a single mind; not only has he exhibited it in a form as free from error as could be hoped from the limitations of any human intellect, however powerful; but throughout his writings he breathes a *spirit* of philosophy more precious, and calculated to exert a more beneficial influence over the reader, than his philosophy itself. They are inspired by an intense love of Truth, and exhibit a rare combination of independence and caution in seeking it;—in-

dependence, in sturdily thrusting aside all authority but that of Reason; caution, in a perpetual recognition of the feebleness and ignorance of that very Reason;—a profound consciousness that the highest achievement of man's wisdom will ever consist in *wisely* ascertaining within what limits alone he *can* be wise. When to these qualities we add the cogency of Locke's logic, his practical sagacity, the unusual vivacity and originality of his modes of treating abstruse subjects, we need not wonder that he is still a favourite with his countrymen, or that he continues to enjoy a European reputation. Hallam remarks, that he should hardly pardon himself for neglecting to put into the hands of any young person, over whose education he had any control, Locke's little tract on the 'Conduct of the Understanding;' and much of it is, in truth, not unworthy of comparison with those portions of the First Book of the 'Novum Organum,' which expose the 'idola' of the human mind. We should, however, go a step further, and should be disposed to censure ourselves if we did not recommend to every young person, who had leisure carefully to peruse it, the larger treatise on the 'Understanding' itself; assured that, whatever the points in which it convinced or failed to convince, few books in any language could more effectually enamour the soul of truth, inspire a contempt of sophistry, develop and discipline the powers of the mind, train it to clearness of thought and expression, inspire it with an ambition to know wherever knowledge is possible, and, (not less signal benefit,) teach it humbly to acquiesce in ignorance where ignorance is inevitable.

Though, like the other greater luminaries of philosophy and science, Locke has shone on with tolerably uniform lustre, he has had, like most of them, his periods, if not of waxing and waning, yet of brighter effulgence or transient obscuration. He seems to us labouring under some such partial eclipse at present. In the reaction against the sensational schools of the last century—in itself a happy revolution—he has been in some danger of having his merits underrated from his presumed connexion with the extravagancies of those schools.

Dugald Stewart, it must be granted, in his admirable criticism on Locke, contained in his celebrated 'Preliminary Dissertation,' (published nearly forty years ago,) did much to adjust the true position of our philosopher in relation to the sensational systems; he did much, in our judgment, to show that Locke's meaning had been perverted or misunderstood, alike by many of his admirers and opponents; but particularly by many of his admirers, who claiming him as a patron of their sensational theories had honoured him with homage equally undeserved

and ruinous. Recent symptoms, however, in the literature both of our own country and of France, where the acute and, in many respects, admirable lectures on Locke by M. Cousin have excited much attention, seem to render some renewed discussion of Locke's position and merits not altogether superfluous.

It is a suspicion of this kind which has induced us, in spite of the necessary disadvantage of having to deal with so ample a theme in the contracted limits of an Article, to dwell on some traits of our great countryman's CHARACTER, and some features of the controversies which chiefly affect the merits of his PHILOSOPHY.

The principal characteristics of the genius of Locke are visible at once to the reader in almost every page. No author has impressed the image of his own mind more indelibly on his works, or given them a character of more perfect originality. Hence, in part, and in great part, the continued popularity they possess, and the delight and profit with which they are perused; delight and profit, as usual, often greater than can be reaped from writings less marked indeed by defects, and even by errors, but tamer in character, and less stimulating to the mind of the student. Some of his characteristics — half moral and half intellectual — have been already adverted to; his rare combination of boldness and caution, of independence and humility,— necessary complements of one another in every true philosopher. To these must be added a wonderful robustness and vigour in the logical faculty, rare sagacity, comprehensiveness and patience in the survey of whatsoever subject attracted his attention, — the characteristics of what he himself so much admired as 'a large 'round-about mind,' — a power of abstraction capable of detaining, separating, and analysing the most evanescent and complicated phenomena of thought, and great copiousness, often felicitous aptness, of homely illustrations and examples in describing and explaining them. A word or two more on two or three of the above peculiarities.

Perhaps, after all, the quality of Locke's intellect which most generally strikes the youthful reader is the force of the logical faculty, partly because it is more easily apprehended than the rest, and partly because it more continually manifests itself. Locke admired Chillingworth intensely, and often strongly reminds us of him. As with Chillingworth, the peculiar vigour of Locke's logic displays itself most in controversy. In the replies to Stillingfleet, but especially in the letters on 'Tolera-'tion,' (certainly the most brilliant, perhaps in his own day the

most useful, of his productions,) it is impossible not to recognise the logical Milo in every page. The unhappy 'Jonas 'Proast,' who ventured to oppose him on the latter subject, is not so much vanquished as annihilated. Like some criminals who have been punished by being blown from a cannon's mouth, not a fragment of the unfortunate champion for persecution is to be found.

But not one of the traits of Locke indicated above—neither his logical acuteness, nor his thirst for truth, nor the sagacity with which he prosecuted his search for it,—is more marked than his habitual recognition of the narrow limits of the human faculties, and his conviction that the chief and most difficult function of a philosopher is to ascertain within what sphere men may legitimately philosophise. Profoundly feeling that there are impassable barriers which environ us on all sides, he is every where anxious to recognise the limits where philosophy must pause, the brink of those abysses and precipices on which there is no access to human hand or foot. Acknowledging without shame —rather with manly modesty—this fact of the true position of man, he never hesitates to confess his ignorance where he is ignorant, nor even in many cases his despair of ever attaining knowledge. His great work originated, as he himself tells us, in a discussion, in which he suspected that the baffling difficulties arose from not having ascertained the limits of the human faculties; and that therefore the first thing is 'to discover the 'powers thereof, how far they reach, to what things they are in 'any degree proportioned, and where they fail us.' In the well-known metaphor, he reminds us that 'it is of great use to the 'sailor to know the length of his line, though he cannot with 'it fathom all the depths of the ocean;' he tells us that 'if the 'capacities of our understanding be well considered, the extent 'of our knowledge once discovered, and the horizon which sets 'the bounds between the enlightened and dark parts of things, '—between what is and what is not comprehensible by us,— 'men would, perhaps, with less scruple acquiesce in the avowed 'ignorance of the one, and employ their thoughts with more 'advantage and satisfaction in the other.' Happy had all philosophers acted on such maxims! But it requires a great deal of courage (especially in a philosopher) frankly to say 'I do not 'know,' and perhaps still more to say, 'I doubt if I ever shall.'

Acting on such maxims, it is refreshing to see with how firm a hand Locke at once applies the knife to those huge wens of 'ontology,' as it was called, which had so long impoverished and almost destroyed all healthy intellectual philosophy. It is thus he proceeds to indicate the principles on which he proposes to

construct his great work, and, in doing so, shows how well he had pondered the limits of a just psychology. 'This, therefore, 'being my purpose, to enquire into the original, certainty, and 'extent of human knowledge, together with the grounds and 'degrees of belief, opinion, and assent; I shall not at present 'meddle with the physical consideration of the mind, or trouble 'myself to examine wherein its essence consists, or by what 'motions of our spirits, or alterations of our bodies, we come to 'have any sensation by our organs, or any ideas in our under-'standings; and whether those ideas do in their formation, any 'or all of them, depend on matter or no.'

To restrict speculation to the limits within which alone philosophy is possible, is, of course, the principal point in relation to what is the great object of *all* philosophy—the discovery of TRUTH; but to transcend those limits in intellectual philosophy is to violate this caution in the most flagrant, though, lamentable to say! the most common form. The very object of this science is to teach us the extent of our faculties, and to develop and invigorate them by the robust discipline it imposes. To involve it in impossible speculation is to lose both benefits at once; to impair and fuddle the intellect at the same time.

The feelings with which one has been sometimes tempted to accompany adventurous speculators beyond the limits of a legitimate intellectual philosophy, and to penetrate the regions of the 'unconditioned,'—the clouds which lie beyond and above the elevations given to man to scale,—may be compared to those with which the lover of the picturesque, in mountain regions, is sometimes lured into a similar delusion. He is tempted, it may be, to ascend some unknown peak on which the clouds still rest, assured that they will clear off before the summit is reached. As the traveller ascends through the lower region, in the clear atmosphere, and with the ample landscape of valley, wood, and water clearly outspread before him, all is pleasant enough. As he approaches the belt of clouds, and begins to have misgivings, some of the party assure him that if he will but go on, the whole will be presently clear. He complies; and first, all the discoveries of a lower elevation begin to be seen through a curtain of mist, their magnitudes are altered, their forms distorted, and ultimately their distinctive features lost. At last, he reaches a point where he can see nothing but a rolling cloud of vapour, which hides every object ten inches before his nose; and after standing wetted to the skin, and shivering in 'darkness visible' for a couple of hours or so, in which the envious clouds still envelope him,—now and then teased, perhaps, by a momentary rent in the veil, which seems to show

him something, but too transiently to let him know what, — he descends, and is glad to catch a glimpse of things in sunlight again. But for any purpose of pleasure or knowledge, in ascending those cloudy regions, he might as well have sat himself down at the base of the mountain and drawn a thick cotton nightcap over his head. Such seems to be the estimate pretty generally forming throughout not only England, but the Continent also, of the philosophical value of a vast deal of German speculation since Kant's time. He, however uncouth his nomenclature, or wearisome his style, did at all events treat of subjects which are the fair domain of speculation, and which it may be presumed the human intellect will be in a condition to settle some day or other, and in one way or another; but as for many of his more ambitious successors, we observe that even folks in England, who, a few short years ago, would have been indulgent towards them, or gratuitously admired without understanding them, are beginning to distrust their own amiable modesty, which always assumed the unfathomable profundity of the writers as the sole cause of their being unintelligible. We observe that even M. Cousin, despairing apparently of the success of his early projects of 'Eclecticism,' at least in this direction, speaks, in a recent and interesting work, of certain tendencies of 'the detestable 'German philosophy,' in terms he would hardly have employed some years ago.* It reminds us of an expression in Sir James Mackintosh's 'Journal,' which, as extorted from one whose patient and persevering industry was not easily baffled, and whose calm and judicial mind was not soon ruffled, is not a little amusing. Even *his* equanimity was not proof against the irritating effect of being conscientiously bound to understand what was in fact not to be understood. When he took his departure for India, he was still meditating, it will be recollected, a history of philosophy, a favourite project, and one which, if he had had leisure and perseverance to complete it, would have been a noble monument of his genius. 'I am endeavouring,' he says, 'to understand this *accursed* German philosophy.' We

* The passage to which we refer occurs in the 'Avant-propos' to his recently published work, entitled 'Madame de Longueville; Nou-'velles Etudes sur les Femmes Illustres et la Société du XVIII^e^ Siècle,' —not the least interesting or valuable of M. Cousin's voluminous productions. 'Il nous reste à recueillir de tous nos écrits les élé-'ments épars d'une Théodicée nouvelle, particulièrement fondée sur 'une Psychologie exacte fecondée par une induction légitime avec le 'double dessein de défendre la grande foi du genre humain *contre la* '*détestable philosophie que l'Allemagne, en ces derniers temps, a* '*renvoyée a la France*,' &c. &c. (P. viii.)

cannot refrain here from recommending every reader to peruse Sir W. Hamilton's 'Essay,' first inserted in this Journal, 'On 'the Philosophy of the Unconditioned,' and to ponder especially its concluding sentences:—'Conscious only of, conscious only in 'and through, limitation, we think to comprehend the infinite; 'and dream even of establishing the science, the *nescience* of 'man, on an identity with the omniscience of God. It is this 'powerful tendency of the most vigorous minds to transcend 'the sphere of our faculties, which makes a "learned ignorance" 'the most difficult acquirement, perhaps, indeed, the consumma-'tion of knowledge. In the words of a forgotten, but acute 'philosoper:—"Magna, immo maxima pars sapientiæ est— '"quædam æquo animo nescire velle."'

Many a treatise of modern philosophy might, we think, be entitled 'Essays on the art of saying nothing in such a way that it cannot be known that nothing has been said.'

It must be granted, of course, that the very principle now inculcated requires, like any other, to be applied wisely, lest it should engender timidity where we may hope to succeed; but excess of caution is certainly an error on the right side.

It may be urged, perhaps, that Locke sometimes seems to depart from this wise caution, especially in his most gratuitous speculation as to whether it would not be possible for Omnipotence to endow 'matter' with 'thought.' We say gratuitous, for he himself did not believe that *our* minds are material, rather he imagined he had proof amounting to 'moral certainty' the other way; and assuredly he had no reason to infer that any other minds are, in some incomprehensible way, any such *grafts* upon matter. Still the very speculation, though in our view not merely presumptuous but irrational, is, in reality, a proof of the very characteristic we have here attributed to Locke, since he declares that he refrained from denying that matter might be susceptible of thought, only because he did not pretend to limit the power of God, who, he said, had given to matter properties to all appearance as inconsistent with its nature as thought itself, and he instances 'gravitation.' But we shall have a word or two to say of this by and by.

Locke's love of truth, though of course essentially a moral excellence, gives an indescribable charm to all the movements of his intellect; it animates, vivifies, transfigures the most tedious processes of logic. The evident desire and longing of his soul is to arrive at truth, and that only; he spares no toil, no patience, in hunting it, nor (when he deems he has found it) in setting it forth as plainly as possible to the apprehension of others.

It is obvious that nothing could, in his judgment, make amends for missing TRUTH; he has no preconceptions which he is determined shall stand; no shame in acknowledging an error; no sinister purposes to answer. As we read him, we feel sure that neither vanity nor interest could have induced him to disguise or mutilate a truth, nor to harbour a sophism, however brilliant and however applauded by others, for one moment in his bosom. They are his own glorious words — 'Whatever I 'write, as soon as I shall discover it not to be TRUTH, my 'hand shall be forwardest to throw it in the fire.'

The same reasons have made him one of the fairest of all controversial antagonists; disguising nothing, distorting nothing, garbling nothing, misquoting nothing; doing his devoir ever manfully, but knightly and honourably, and disdaining to use any weapons in the cause of truth which truth itself has not consecrated. These qualities, wherever they are found, must in the nature of things tend to give vastly augmented force to any man's logic. The intellect is more indebted to the love of truth than its worshippers generally suppose, and any aids which the understanding lends the conscience are ever faithfully repaid.

The fairness of Locke as a disputant, even in the excitement of oral controversy, (where it is so rarely exemplified), is noticed by Le Clerc. 'He accommodated himself to the level of the 'most moderate understanding, and *in disputing with them, did* '*not diminish the force of their arguments against himself, although* '*they were not well expressed by those who had used them;*' a scrupulosity, which may remind one of Charles James Fox, who, it is said, sometimes stated an opponent's objections so strongly that his friends trembled lest he should not be able to answer them!

His ironical tone in controversy is often very amusing; but it is seldom accompanied with either bitterness or sarcasm. Perhaps one of the severest things he ever said was his quiet retort on Stillingfleet, who had charged him with some gross blunder: 'I acknowledge myself to be a mortal man, very liable to mis-'takes,—and especially in your lordship's writings!'

As to the *learning* of Locke, it has, like that of Shakspeare, been most variously estimated. While some would make him almost ignorant of what his predecessors had written, and such a very Troglodyte in metaphysics that he was not properly acquainted even with such writers as Descartes or Hobbes,—others are of opinion (with Stillingfleet) that he is under vast but unconscious obligations to them. The truth lies, as usual, between the extreme estimates. To suppose that a mind so inquisitive and powerful as Locke's should not have been tolerably conversant

with the principal productions of philosophers, is extravagant; to suppose that a mind so original and independent should be a servile imitator, is equally so. If any man ever thought for himself, it was Locke. He avows it everywhere, that he had faithfully endeavoured to trace the origin and analyse the composition of thought in his own mind, totally careless what might or might not be the opinions of others. His whole work bears the marks of this; and if he has erred, it is in not having sufficiently and carefully examined the opinions of others.

The metaphysician, above almost any other thinker, must, to use a favourite expression of Leibnitz, draw *de son propre fond*,—from his own resources; patient excogitation must be his great instrument. Indeed, *all* great thinkers will rather delight in this than in mere acquisition; it ever has been and ever will be their *characteristic*. But then to be safe, such self-reliance must be accompanied with a careful survey of what has been done by others in the same field; to neglect this is not only bad economy of time and labour, inasmuch as it is to dispense with the vantage-ground gained for us by others, but to run the risk of *discovering* what has already been *discovered*, and of propounding to the world as novelties what the world has long possessed. It is, however, of equally pernicious consequence in another way; it leads an author to forget the prepossessions and prejudices under which others have been accustomed to view the subjects he treats. His ignorance may put him out of a position wisely to anticipate their objections and to free his own statements from apparent ambiguities. It is true it is difficult to say within what limits the one or the other quality of mind should be cherished; on the one hand, the faculty of vigorous and independent thought may be fettered and repressed, and a mind original enough and vigorous enough for higher tasks may sink into a mere *litterateur*, or a retailer of other men's wares; on the other hand, it may unconsciously lapse into much the same thing by neglecting a survey of what other men's toils have already accomplished.*

---

* Among the many passages in which Locke asserts his independence of authority, one of the most remarkable is that in which he replies to Stillingfleet's implied charge of plagiarism from Descartes:—'It is hard to avoid thinking that your lordship means that I borrowed from him my notions concerning Certainty. And your lordship is so great a man, and every way so far above my meanness, that it cannot be supposed that your lordship intended this for anything but a commendation of me to the world as the scholar of so great a master. But though I must always acknowledge to that justly-admired gentleman the great obligation of my first deliver-

Another striking characteristic of Locke, and which distinguishes him from many metaphysicians, is, that his power of external observation is almost as marked as that of introspection. It was no doubt largely developed by that study of medicine, for which he was so eminently fitted, and in which he so much excelled; but not by that only. His extensive travels, his busy public life, his practical habits, must have kept this talent in continual exercise, and more than counterpoised any undue tendency to what is apt to be the vice of great intellectual philosophers — excess of abstraction. Hence, too, as has frequently been observed, his great work is written in the style of one who had evidently seen much of life; it speaks the dialect of the world; it is familiar and colloquial beyond that of any other great work of any other philosopher in any age. A similar tact for observation is evinced in this work in a more direct way; it not only analyses the mental phenomena of man in general, but perpetually shows that the author has had a watchful and observant eye on the diversities of intellectual character which have come in his way,—that he has not only studied *man*, but *men*. In this shrewd and vigilant inspection both of general humanity and of individual character, he has some resemblance at once to Aristotle and Socrates. A little volume of weighty maxims of conduct, founded on observation of man and the world might be easily compiled from his writings; many of which would do no discredit to Bacon's 'Essays,' or Pascal's 'Thoughts.' One of his practical maxims must no doubt have been tolerably impressed on his own memory by the necessity of acting upon it, in that wary walking which all his early life required, especially under the *espionage* of his 'friend,' Dr. John Fell; 'Do not hear yourself say to another, what you would 'not have another hear from him.' Another well worth remembering is, 'Let your will lead whither necessity would 'drive, and you will always preserve your liberty.'

The union of comprehensiveness and sagacity in Locke is strikingly displayed in the variety of the subjects which employed his mind, and the success, notwithstanding, with which he treated them. On all the chief topics of importance agitated

---

'ance from the unintelligible way of talking of the philosophy in use 'in the schools in his time, yet I am so far from entitling his writings 'to any of the errors or imperfections which are to be found in my 'Essay, as deriving their original from him, that I must own to your 'lordship they were spun barely out of my own thoughts, reflecting, 'as well as I could, on my own mind, and the ideas I had there; and 'were not, that I know, derived from any other original.' (*Locke's Works*, vol. iii. pp. 48, 49. 8vo. London.)

in his day he has left us his thoughts; on Religious Toleration, on Civil Government, on Education, on several questions of Economical Science, a science then in its cradle,—and on all these varied subjects, he has advanced the boundary-line of human knowledge, extricated some principles before unknown, approximated more nearly to truth in the statement of some which were disputed, and dispelled many pernicious and formidable errors.

The study of medicine, to which he had been early destined, formed, as Stewart says, no bad preparation for his future metaphysical career. It continued throughout life a favourite pursuit. That he had acquired considerable knowledge of the science, may well be inferred from the compliments of the eminent Sydenham, who dedicated to him his great work on the History and Cure of Acute Diseases.

The observation of Dugald Stewart, above referred to, is worth citing: 'No science could have been chosen more happily 'calculated than medicine to prepare such a mind as that of 'Locke for the prosecution of those speculations which have 'immortalised his name; the complicated, and fugitive, and 'often equivocal phenomena of disease requiring in the observer 'a far greater portion of discriminating sagacity than those of 'physics properly so called.'

Indeed, such is the alliance between the habitudes of mind in both departments of thought that we are almost inclined to say that every *physician* ought also to be a *metaphysician*. Sure we are, at all events, that a sound course of early study in intellectual philosophy—a careful analysis of the evanescent and subtle phenomena of mind—must prove of admirable service to him who would succeed in what is confessedly the most difficult of all the sciences of observation; and we think the history of many of the most eminent physicians would go to sustain this assertion. Certainly, in the medical philosophers we have had the pleasure of knowing, we have observed a marked amplitude and expansion in the views of their profession when they have enjoyed such early training. We are now speaking, of course, simply of the discipline of these pursuits on the habits of thought; but such is the intimate connexion of the two parts of our nature, that a knowledge of the anatomy of mind becomes almost as necessary to the physician as a knowledge of that of the body.

The understanding of Locke was, like that of so many eminent Englishmen, peculiarly *practical*, as the subjects to which he turned his attention sufficiently show. As compared with some minds of far greater harmony and variety of powers, he appears decidedly deficient; almost, we might say, truncated.

The intellect absorbed to itself some of his other faculties; so that they either appear shrunk, like muscles not used, or they must have been originally feeble in comparison.

To all the forms of the Beautiful, for example, and all the fine arts, he seems to have been almost insensible. Plato is full of poetry; Aristotle could at least criticise it profoundly; Bacon is almost Shakspeare in a philosophic garb, so resplendent is his imagination, and so versatile his genius. It is curious that there is hardly a passing remark in all Locke's great work on any of the æsthetical or emotional characteristics of humanity: so that, for anything that appears, men might have nothing of the kind in their composition. As for poetry, it is true that at the close of the seventeenth century, and for many a long day after, English poetry was at a miserably low ebb; yet it would not be easy to find a mind at all approaching Locke's in general power, equally enamoured with Blackmore's dull strains; of whom he says in one of his letters, 'His vein of poetry is what 'everybody must allow him to have an extraordinary talent in.' But the mode in which he cashiers the whole 'Sacred Nine,' in his Treatise on Education, and recommends the early suppression in a youth of any dangerous propensities for their company, most clearly shows the traits of character we are now illustrating. After speaking against the practice of making boys write Latin verses (which truly do not often evince or cherish any dangerous excess in the poetic faculty), he says: 'I have much more, and of more weight, against their 'making verses of any sort;' for if a youth 'has no genius to 'poetry, it is the most unreasonable thing in the world to tor-'ment him and waste his time about that which can never suc-'ceed; and if he *have* a poetic vein, *it is to me the strangest* 'thing in the world that the father should desire or suffer it to be 'cherished or improved. Methinks the parents should labour to 'have *it stifled and suppressed as much as may be!*' There is much more to the same purpose. 'It is very seldom seen,' he adds, 'that any one discovers mines of gold or silver in Par-'nassus. It is a pleasant air, but a barren soil.'

With such insensibility to the beautiful, and such strong 'utilitarian' bias, we need not wonder that he desires, in his Treatise on Education, that every young gentleman should not only have every incipient symptom of poetry nipped in the bud, but should be sedulously instructed in some trade or handicraft even though he might never be compelled to practise it. The elder Osbaldistone, in *Rob Roy*, might have served for his model; and no doubt Locke would have sympathised in all the horror of that worthy merchant, when the unlucky 'Ode to the Memory

'of the Black Prince' dropped out of his son's Commonplace Book in which were entered the jumble of memoranda respecting 'barils and barricants—Corn-debentures—Gentish—Titlings 'and Lubfish.'—'"To the Memory of Edward the Black '"Prince." What's all this? Verses! By Heaven, Frank, 'you are a greater blockhead than I supposed you!'

Yet it cannot be said that this insensibility to the beautiful is the result of any deficiency of imagination. That faculty in Locke is active enough perpetually to supply him with apt, though generally, it is true, homely illustration; and sometimes with images of great felicity and power. Those, so often cited from his chapter on 'Retention,' afford examples of this; some of them are not only beautiful, but, as Sir James Mackintosh says, acquire pathos, as possibly indicating some sense of personal decay in the author. We may add that the very language has a solemn cadence, a touching and mournful flow, exquisitely adapted to the sentiment:—

'The ideas as well as children of our youth often die before us; and our minds represent to us those tombs to which we are approaching, where, though the brass and marble remain, yet the inscriptions are effaced by time, and the imagery moulders away. . . . We sometimes find a disease quite strip the mind of all its ideas, and the flames of a fever in a few days *calcine* all those images to dust and confusion which seemed to be as lasting as if graved in marble.'

His sense of humour and his powers of raillery must have been very considerable. Nor had he only that dry species of logical humour (if we may use the phrase) which is often found in very close reasoners,—where fallacies and sophisms are so neatly exposed, the nut cracked and the shell thrown away with such a self-possessed air, or unexpected deductions so suddenly evolved from trivial premises, that the feat often produces much of the ludicrous surprise which is the proper effect of wit. Many of the apt anecdotes introduced into his philosophical works strongly show his sense of the ludicrous; as, for example, the well known one of the blind man, who flattered himself that at length he knew what was the colour of scarlet, namely, that it was like the sound of a trumpet;—by which Locke illustrates the impossibility of imparting the simple ideas of any sense to those who are destitute of that sense. The story with which he ridicules Stillingfleet in the following passage may serve as another example:—

'To my saying that your lordship had not told me what Nature is, I am told that, "if I had a mind to understand you, I could not but "see that by Nature you meant the subject of essential properties."

A lady asking a learned physician what the spleen was, received this answer, that it was the receptacle of the melancholy humour. She had a mind to understand what the spleen was, but by this definition of it found herself not much enlightened; and therefore went on to ask what the melancholy humour was; and, by the doctor's answer, found that the spleen and the melancholy humour had a relation one to the other; but what the spleen was she knew not one jot better than she did before he told her any thing about it.'

But it is in his letters and journals, published in 'Lord 'King's Life,' that his latent powers of pleasantry are most strongly indicated; and perhaps two or three brief passages may tend to relieve the necessary gravity of the present article. It is thus he drolls on the manners of the Bœotian folks of Cleves, 'who,' he says, 'were the slowest people and fullest of 'delays that ever he met with.'

'Three days were spent in finding out a glover; for, though I can walk all the town over in less than an hour, yet their shops are so contrived as if they designed to conceal, not to expose, their wares; and though you may think it strange, yet, methinks, it is very well done, and 'tis a becoming modesty to conceal that which they have reason enough to be ashamed of. But to proceed: the two next days were spent in drawing them on; the right hand glove (or, as they call them here, hand-shoe), Thursday, and the left hand, Friday; and I'll promise you this was two good days' work, and little enough to bring them to fit my hands and to consent to be fellows, which, after all, they are so far from, that when they are on, I am always afraid my hands should go to cuffs one with another, they so disagree. Saturday we concluded on the price, computed and changed our money; for it requires a great deal of arithmetic and a great deal of brass to pay twenty-eight *stivers* and seven *doits;* but, Heaven be thanked, they are all well fitted with counters for reckoning; for their money is good for nothing else, and I am poor here with my pockets full of it. I wondered at first why the market-people brought their wares in little carts, drawn by one horse, till I found it necessary to carry home the price of them; for a horse-load of turnips would be two horse-loads of money. A pair of shoes cannot be got under half-a-year; I lately saw the cow killed out of whose hide I hope to have my next pair; and the first thing after they are married here, is, to bespeak the child's coat.' *

Not less ludicrous is his description of a dinner at a monastery of Franciscan friars. Part of it is as follows:—

'We were all very quiet, and, after some silence, in marched a solemn procession of peas-porridge, every one his dish. I could not tell by the looks what it was, till, putting my spoon in for discovery, some few peas in the bottom peeped up. I had pity on them, and

* Lord King's Life of Locke, 4to., pp. 16, 17.

was willing enough to spare them, but was forced, by good manners, though against my nature and appetite, to destroy some of them; so on I fell. All this while not a word; I could not tell whether to impute the silence to the eagerness of their stomachs, which allowed their mouths no other employment but to fill them, or any other reason; I was confident it was not in admiration of their late music. At last, the oracle of the place spoke, and told them he gave them leave to speak to entertain me. I returned my compliment, and then to discourse we went, helter skelter, as hard as our bad Latin and worse pronunciation on each side would let us; but no matter, we cared not for Priscian, whose head suffered that day not a little. However, this saved me from the peas-pottage, and the peas-pottage from me; for now I had something else to do. Our next course was, every one his act of fish, and butter to boot; but whether it were intended for fresh or salt fish I cannot tell, and I believe it is a question as hard as any Thomas ever disputed. . . . . The Prior had upon the table by him a little bell, which he rang when he wanted any thing, and those that waited never brought him any thing, or took away, but they bowed with much reverence, and kissed the table. . . . The first that kissed the table did it so leisurely, that I thought he had held his head there that the Prior, during our silence, might have wrote something on his bald crown, and made it sink that way into his understanding.'*

He thus concludes a most interesting letter to Mr. Cudworth, in India, to whom, though a stranger, he says he writes with freedom, as the brother of the Lady (Masham) in whose society he found so much happiness at Oates. After requesting information on a variety of subjects, he makes *distance* an additional apology for abridging ceremony in scraping acquaintance: — 'If, at this distance, we should set out, according to 'the forms of ceremony, our correspondence would proceed with 'a more grave and solemn pace than the treaties of princes; 'and we must spend some years in the very preliminaries. He 'that, in his first address, should only put off his hat, and make 'a leg, and say, "Your servant," to a man at the other end of 'the world, may, if the winds set right, and the ships come 'home safe, and bring back the return of his compliment, may, 'I say, in two or three years, perhaps, attain to something that 'looks like the beginning of an acquaintance; and, by the 'next jubilee, there may be hopes of some conversation between 'them. Sir, you see what a blunt fellow your sister has re-'commended to you; as far removed from the ceremonies of 'the Eastern people you are amongst, as from their own 'country; but one that with great truth and sincerity, &c. &c.'†

* Lord King's Life of Locke, 4to., p. 22.

† Ibid., p. 250.

The *style* of Locke is, like himself, plain, homely, business-like, practical; devoid, it is true, of much grace or elegance, and often copious to diffuseness, but perpetually lighted up with vivacious illustration, which tends to keep the attention of the reader alive. Considering the condition of the language when he wrote, (just feeling its way to the elegance of diction and construction at which it arrived in Addison's time,) Locke's is a very favourable specimen of English style, and, assuredly, carries away the palm from that of any preceding philosophical writer. It is true, indeed, he cannot make pretensions to that peculiar *netteté* — we know not by what other name to call it — by which the French philosophic writers have been distinguished from the time of Descartes and Pascal to that of Cousin; exhibiting an admirable combination of clearness, beauty, and simplicity, to which, though we may flatter ourselves that our countrymen have not been inferior in depth or comprehensiveness, English philosophers cannot make equal pretensions. If our language, as nobody disputes, is superior to the French for all purposes of poetry, compensation seems to be made by the more exact adaptation of the latter to the purposes of philosophical exposition; or, if it be not so, why, at all events, their writers have the more merit in having learned how to use their instrument with greater grace than we have ours. The elegance which we have reserved for the *belles lettres* — — for such books as Addison's Essays and Cowper's Letters — French writers have to a considerable extent diffused over philosophy. No doubt the perspicuity, as well as grace, which distinguish these writers is owing, in a great degree, to the same characteristic which gives the former quality, though with a less infusion of the latter, to our own Locke; and that is, an impatience of saying anything which the mind does not sharply define to itself. There is a constant temptation to metaphysicians, above all other classes of writers, to rest content with less than the utmost attainable definiteness of expression, often excusable from the subtlety of really legitimate topics of speculation. How inevitable then must be the obscurity when the topics transcend all the powers of the human intellect! No wonder that, in that case — and how frequent has it been of late years! — language becomes a gibberish, which serves only to veil ignorance in the depth of no meaning. Neither the French, nor any other language, can express clear notions on subjects on which men can have no clear conceptions, or convey a meaning when there is no meaning to convey. Probably M. Cousin has done as much as could be done by mortal expositor to make the German enigmas of the 'unconditioned'

intelligible; yet we must freely acknowledge that even the French breaks down there, and breaks down even with him. The same may be said of our countryman Mr. J. D. Morell's strenuous effort to translate the same obscurities, wherein he has been further aided — and yet often to little purpose — with the reflected light of M. Cousin's 'Cours de Philosophie.' But how different is the spectacle when we turn from M. Cousin lecturing on Schelling or Hegel to M. Cousin lecturing on Locke! Here we can say of him just as we say of the great author on whom he comments, that even when we do not agree with him, we yet clearly understand him. We often think he fails to do Locke justice — that he often exaggerates his errors — that he often misconceives him — that, in his eagerness to father on him the dogmas of the sensational school, he has been betrayed into serious error; but still, as in Locke or Descartes, each single statement is delightfully transparent, requiring active and intelligent thought, indeed, in the reader, but never leaving the mind in an utter maze of bewilderment as to whether you agree or disagree; or with this sole, but intimate conviction — that you clearly understand that you do *not* understand!

The moral excellences of Locke are so intimately connected with his intellectual, and give and take so much colour from them, that it is not very possible, as in the analysis of other characters, readily to separate them. His love of truth, for example, was equally a sentiment of the heart and an intellectual appetency. Something like it may be said of his prudence, which, in him, was both a virtue and an instinct, and was so enormously developed that it deserves a distinct mention.

The possession of this quality might be inferred both from the practical and cautious character of his understanding, and from the coldness of his temperament. But it is a quality rarely developed so early, or so uniformly displayed, as in him. Still less is it capable of being combined with such entire independence of mind. Hardly ever, we believe, did man so earnestly and sturdily pursue his own path, and yet so rarely traverse that of others. Prudence in him amounted to a kind of instinct — we may almost say, with M. Cousin, 'Locke était né sage en 'quelque sorte; on peut dire qu'il y avait en lui quelque chose 'de Socrate ou au moins de Franklin.' When, in 1684, the tyrannical court wished for his expulsion from the university, gave orders to the servile Bishop Fell to find an occasion against him, if possible, and commanded that his words and actions should be narrowly watched for this purpose, the too pliant and treacherous tool gives his 'friend' this testimony in his reply

to Sunderland's application: — 'Mr. Locke being, as your 'Lordship is truly informed, a person who was much trusted by 'the late Earl of Shaftesbury, and who is suspected to be ill-'affected to the Government, I have for divers years had an eye 'upon him; but so close has his guard been on himself, that 'after several strict inquiries, I may confidently affirm there is 'not any one in the college, however familiar with him, who has 'heard him speak a word either against, or so much as concern-'ing the Government; and although very frequently, both in 'public and in private, discourses have been purposely intro-'duced, to the disparagement of his master, the Earl of Shaftes-'bury, his party, and designs, he could never be provoked to 'take any notice, or discover in word or look the least concern; 'so that I believe *there is not in the world such a master of 'taciturnity and passion.*'

His friends, we are told, in all sorts of affairs, repaired to him as to an oracle; which we may well believe, when we learn that Lord Ashley applied to him, though a bachelor, to choose a wife for his son (a task which Locke happily accomplished), and that his sick friends took his prescriptions, though there are few things people like less than an amateur doctor. Involved, in the course of his life, in many perplexing and even dangerous situations, and often brought into contact with very queer political associates, he appears never to have compromised his safety, nor forfeited his integrity. In early life, indeed, we are told that he was characterised by a trait which, of all, is the most inconsistent with prudence — he was rather *choleric;* but we are also told that he had taken immense pains to put down this propensity; and we may well believe that he was successful, since we are assured he was so anxious for its subjugation, that he was never so angry with another as he always was with himself for *having been angry.*

The sturdy independence and rectitude of his character were worthy accompaniments of his firm and truth-loving intellect. Ardently attached to the principles of true patriotism and true liberty, he showed on every occasion a consistent adherence to them; familiar, in early life, with the spectacle of boundless political profligacy, brought into close relations with men of no very scrupulous political consciences, and enjoying considerable opportunities of benefiting himself during the reign of William, no shadow of a stain rests either on his private or his public conduct; no corrupt ends or mean compliances can be charged upon him. When his asthma rendered him incapable of *fully* discharging his public duties, he resigned his seat at the Board of Trade, in spite of the earnest

entreaties of the Chancellor. Similar reasons induced him to decline another and seemingly more lucrative appointment, urged on him by the King himself, who hinted that he could receive the emoluments, and leave the duties to be partly discharged by deputy. Locke said he could not find it consistent with his conscience to retain public money for public duties which he was unable to perform.

Stewart speaks of a certain austerity of character in Locke, and attributes it to his puritanical education. It is hardly worth while to investigate the cause of a very problematical trait. He founds the charge, indeed, on two or three unwisely rigorous precepts in the treatise on Education; but the general tone of that treatise is full of a genuine spirit of humanity, and especially condemns the then prevalent 'discipline of stripes,' to use Hallam's expression. As regards the above impression, (not certainly confined to Stewart) it seems to have arisen principally from the evident want of enthusiasm in Locke's temperament,—he was never married, never, as far as we know, even in love,—from his perpetual 'utilitarian' bias, his utter insensibility to every thing that was not practical, and probably from the precision and formality with which his transaction of all business was marked. But Le Clerc bears witness that his social character was delightful; his pleasantry abundant, but never offensive: and he gives one trait which we are confident never yet belonged to a morose man,—he so hated solitude, that when not hard at study, he always sought company, though it were that of a child. 'He liked exercise, but 'the complaint on his chest not allowing him to walk much, 'he used to ride after dinner; when he could no longer bear 'the motion of a horse, he used to go out in a wheel chaise; 'and he always wished for a companion, even if it were only a 'child, for he felt pleasure in talking with well-bred children.' That he wanted not a feeling heart, his habitual, though as might be expected in him, wisely dispensed and thoroughly considered charities, bore witness. It is impossible to have a doubt about the nobility and generosity of his disposition, after reading that remarkable letter in which he accepts Newton's confessions of having deeply wronged him. It is hard to say in that correspondence (we can but refer the reader to it) which of the two appears the more magnanimous.

Let us also listen to a few traits given by Le Clerc.

'He considered civility not only as something agreeable and proper to gain people's hearts, but as a duty of Christianity which ought to be more insisted on than it commonly is. . . . . His conversation was very agreeable to all sorts of people, and even to ladies;

and nobody was better received than he was among people of the highest rank. . . . . Those who courted the acquaintance of Mr. Locke, to collect what might be learned from a man of his understanding, and who approached him with respect, were surprised to find in him not only the manners of a well-bred man, but also all the attention which they could expect. . . . . He was very charitable to the poor, provided they were not the idle or the profligate, who did not frequent any church, or who spent their Sundays in an alehouse. He felt, above all, compassion for those who, after having worked hard in their youth, sunk into poverty in their old age. He said that it was not sufficient to keep them from starving, but that they ought to be enabled to live with some comfort. He sought opportunities of doing good to deserving objects; and often in his walks he visited the poor of the neighbourhood, and gave them the wherewithal to relieve their wants, or to buy the medicines which he prescribed for them if they were sick, and had no medical aid.

'He did not like any thing to be wasted; which was, in his opinion, losing the treasure of which God has made us the economists. He himself was very regular, and kept exact accounts of every thing. . . . . He was kind to his servants, and showed them with gentleness how he wished to be served. He not only kept strictly a secret which had been confided to him, but he never mentioned anything which could prove injurious, although he had not been enjoined secrecy; nor could he ever wrong a friend by any sort of indiscretion or inadvertency.'

It really seems impossible to imagine a social character more free from the imputed defect, nor a better exemplification of the fact that it is possible to combine an innocent cheerfulness with the gravity of philosophy; severely regulated habits, and complete control of mere passion and enthusiasm, with ready sympathy for all that really claimed it.

But it is high time that we proceed to make our proposed remarks on Locke's Philosophy.

It is impossible to deny that the immortal 'Essay' is disfigured by serious blemishes — by some errors, and many inconsistencies and ambiguities. The latter flowed chiefly from that figurative and popular style which is yet one of its most attractive, as well as serviceable features; but partly also from the desultory manner in which the Essay was composed, and the length of time (nearly twenty years) occupied in its completion. This allowed, it is true, time for elaboration; but it also allowed time for the 'sleepy nods' which proverbially overtake a man in a 'long work;' and for those variations which are sure to characterise every large edifice when it is an aggregate of accretions. Hence the apparent, and sometimes real inconsistencies and ambiguities of expression which are found in Locke's

frequent repetitions of the same or similar thoughts, and which have made it possible for critics to fight so long even over the fundamental principles of his philosophy. Of errors,—some are the errors of the defective philosophy of his age which he did so much to correct; but others, as for example, his infelicitous theory of personal identity, and his gratuitous speculation as to the possibility of 'thinking matter,' are his own unchallenged and unenvied property. But whatever the faults of his book, and we have no wish to extenuate them, it may be fearlessly asked, when was an equally extensive metaphysical work,—viewed, as it ought of course to be, relatively to the age in which the author lived,—infected with less? Assuredly the philosophies of Aristotle, Plato, Descartes would require as large deductions to be made from them; so immense is the difficulty attending the clear extrication and expression of truth in intellectual philosophy as compared with any other. It is a curious paradox, no doubt, that when man is studying *his own mind*, he should be there often most lost; that he is often apt most to wander where he is most at home. Is it from the obscurity and labyrinths of the dwelling, or from its amplitude and extent? a cynic might ask. The fact is so, however, and though humiliating, is instructive. It is in that science wherein the mind makes its appeal to its own direct consciousness, that it often finds it most difficult to agree with itself or with other minds, and encounters mysteries which have been mysteries through all time, and are likely to be so still.

Still, in spite of numerous *maculæ*, the 'Essay on the Under-'standing' is, on the whole, by far the largest and most accurate map traced, up to Locke's time, by any single mind, of the phenomena of the human consciousness; further, without denying his great obligations to previous labourers in the same field, it may be justly said, that probably no philosopher (except Aristotle) ever observed so many facts of mind not distinctly pointed out before; that none have, singly, penetrated so far into the *terra incognita* of the intellectual world, or left so carefully compiled a chart of the coasts surveyed, or in so many instances rectified and adjusted the less accurate observations of predecessors. We certainly know of no other work, even now, which so often and so distinctly arrests the surprise and attention of the youthful metaphysician by revealing to him the hitherto unrealised facts of his own consciousness; or which so often turns the vague mutter of that consciousness into articulate language; none which so often induces him to say, 'I am sensible of that—'how often have I felt so and so, and never thought of it, nor had 'it stated to me, before.' In a word, the statement of Stewart

may be adopted without abatement:—'that though the two first 'books of the Essay are inferior to the two last, yet they are the 'richest contribution of well-observed and well-described facts 'which was ever bequeathed to this branch of science by a 'single individual, and are the indisputable, though not always 'acknowledged source of some of the most refined conclusions 'with respect to the intellectual phenomena, which have been 'since brought to light by succeeding inquirers.'*

It is not the least admirable feature of the work, that with no lack of comprehensiveness, or depth, or subtlety of thought, whenever these are necessary, nearly the whole,—and it is a very unusual achievement with metaphysicians—is level to the comprehension of any reader who brings to its perusal only ordinary acuteness, and *will* bring to it but ordinary patience. Even when he does not agree with the author, he perfectly understands what he means. This is in part owing to those peculiarities of Locke's style of which we have sufficiently spoken; but quite as much to his impatience of thoughts which did not assume a sharp and definite outline to his own apprehension;—a characteristic for which, as well as for his method of appealing exclusively to consciousness as the basis of mental science, he was immeasurably indebted to the study of Descartes. His writings Locke greatly admired, and to his influence, as we have seen, he avows his signal early obligations,—much as he recoiled from many of the tenets of the Cartesian philosophy.

It is impossible to avoid detaining the reader, for a while, on that long and not yet exhausted controversy, respecting the extent to which Locke is responsible or otherwise for the extravagancies of the Sensational schools, especially of the French, which avowedly referred to him as their patron;—an honour which, we apprehend, would have been about as acceptable to Locke as it would have been to Aristotle to know that he was to be held responsible for all the comments of the schoolmen, or to Milton, to learn that his 'Satan' would be pleaded by Lord Byron in defence of 'Cain.'

There is nothing of which we feel more convinced, than that Locke would have recoiled with abhorrence from all attempts of men of the Condillac and Condorcet stamp to reduce all knowledge to sensation—to sensation proper, or sensation 'transformed;'—which last expression, if it had had any distinct meaning at all, might well have suggested doubts to those who used it, whether they were not conceding by the

* Preliminary Dissertation.

change of phrase what, by a *mere* change of phrase, they were attempting to conceal. He who should contend that there is no essential difference between the vital fluid which circulates in our veins, and our food from which it is extracted, would seem hardly to satisfy our doubts by saying that blood is only 'transformed' beef and mutton. Is it not so, it might be said: do these not contain the elements which enter into it? Very true: but is not that subtle and intricate internal apparatus of chemistry which transmutes these elements into something so different by its own mysterious action, to go for something?

We have said that this controversy is not yet exhausted, perhaps we should rather say, that it *ought* to have been exhausted. But metaphysicians, like the English at Waterloo, have the faculty of not knowing when they are beaten, though not always with as much reason for their ignorance; and, what is equally strange, in the present and many other cases, it is not always very easy for even the spectator to know *which* party is beaten. We have not much doubt, therefore, that this old controversy over Locke's suspected or imputed delinquencies will be fought over and over again. Meantime the very frequency of the combat not only shows the obstinacy of the controversy, but makes it more difficult of decision. Already have Locke's words been so often quoted, misquoted, perverted, and supplemented, and such a voluminous body of controversy raised about them, that as in the case of the trampled body of Gustavus Adolphus, whose very features were almost trodden out under the heap of combatants who fought and fell around him, it is difficult to recognise Locke's true lineaments.

That Locke himself must in part bear the blame of all this, cannot be disputed. His language, as already said, is often deficient in precision; he does not use the same terms with steadiness; and, writing in a style eminently popular for such subjects, he has availed himself very freely of colloquial and metaphorical language; language which, though in general admirably adapted to convey his meaning to the intelligence of ordinary readers, has paid the usual penalty of involving occasional obscurity. All this has been generally admitted. It may also be suspected that the self-reliant temper of Locke, on which we have already made some remarks,—his almost exclusive dependence on a profound inspection of his own consciousness, and comparative indifference to the literature and criticism of his subject,—may, in some measure, have contributed to the same results by leading him to guard insufficiently against the prepossessions under which many of his readers would come to his

statements, and against the ambiguity which would attach to many of the terms used differently by others, and not defined with the requisite rigour by himself. A critical acquaintance with the literature of a subject is well calculated to make a man aware of the points in which terms are liable to be misunderstood by others and to guard against their misapprehensions of them as used by himself. But a cause of obscurity (in this as in many other cases) more powerful than ignorance of the literature of the *past,* was the impossibility of anticipating the controversies of the *future;* when a more exact weighing of all the terms Locke had used would discover much that is ambiguous and fluctuating. It was just so with Descartes' first statements respecting his innate ideas; and he was, no doubt, sincerely surprised, as he says he was in more than one place, at the meaning which men put upon them. Thus it ever is; each succeeding philosopher exposes some of the inaccuracies and negligencies of his predecessors, but if he has added new matter of his own, (all unconscious of the sifting to which it will be subjected,) he is sure to deposit in his own writings the larvæ of future controversies.

But the acknowledged peculiarities of Locke's style, and especially the laxity and freedom of a popular phraseology, ought to make critics so much the more anxious to interpret him only on the principle of a scrupulous comparison and collation of seemingly inconsistent or fluctuating expressions; and most certainly ought to prevent them from taking any such apparent fluctuations of expression in contradiction to his express assertions where there is no such fluctuation to be charged. If an author has made use of expressions which seem hard to be reconciled, and susceptible of *two* meanings, we never, on that account, allow them to override an expression which is perfectly plain. As for the apparently inconsistent expressions, we endeavour, if possible, to reconcile them; if we cannot do that, we say, that the author has blundered, or has been forgetful, or careless, or what not; but we do not take the obscure and incoherent expressions wherewith to interpret such as are neither the one nor the other; nor either of two apparently inconsistent expressions as the sole and absolute criterion of his meaning. The maxim of theological critics, that passages of Scripture perfectly plain are not to be interpreted by such as are obscure, but the obscure by the plain, is a very reasonable one; and it were well if in criticism generally the same rule were fairly applied.

Such justice, we think, has not been dealt out to Locke in the present instance; for it has been maintained by many—

and amongst them we regret to say even recently, by some of our own countrymen — that Locke has really reduced all human knowledge to *one* source, namely, sensation; and that the sensational school may rightfully plead his authority for their errors to a far greater extent than we believe they ever justly can. This has been maintained, though Locke has distinctly and over and over again affirmed that he traces human knowledge not to *one*, but to *two*, distinct sources or fountains, — Sensation *and* Reflection. Now we contend that no doubtful expressions, still less a critic's inferences as to what Locke must be *supposed* to have meant by other expressions, ought to be allowed to overbear this distinct affirmation. His often-quoted words are: —

'These *two* are the fountains of knowledge, from whence all the ideas we have or can naturally have, do spring. *First*, our senses, conversant about particular sensible objects, do convey into the mind several distinct perceptions of things, according to those various ways wherein those objects do affect them. . . . . *Secondly*, The *other* fountain, from which *experience* furnisheth the understanding with ideas*, is the perception of the operations of our own mind within us, as it is employed about the ideas it has got; which operations, when the soul comes to reflect on and consider, do *furnish the understanding with another set of ideas, which could not be had from things without.* . . . . This source of ideas every man has *wholly in himself;* and though it be not sense, *as having nothing to do with external objects*, yet it is very like it, and might properly enough be called *internal* sense. . . . . These *two*, I say, viz. external

---

* May not the misconception of Locke's meaning be partly due to the more limited signification which the word 'experience' has very generally suggested as compared with that in which it was evidently employed by him? From associating it so commonly with the phenomena of sensation, critics both for and against the sensational school have often used it as exclusively confined to those phenomena; but it is evident that Locke had no such restriction, but intended it to embrace all the information derived from conscious activity in the mind itself as well as that derived from the external world. Thus, when he has declared that the mind derives all its materials of knowledge ultimately from 'experience,' and has explained that the *first* source of that experience is sense, he then goes on in the above passage to say that 'the *other* fountain from which *experience* furnisheth the understanding with ideas' is one from which flow 'a set of ideas which could *not* be had from things without.'

We have thought it the more necessary to insist on the possible degradation of Locke's real meaning occasioned by the adventitious limitation of the term 'experience,' as we do not recollect that any critic has expressly referred to it.

material things, as the objects of sensation; and the operations of our own minds within, as the objects of reflection; are to me the only originals from whence all our ideas take their beginnings. . . . . In time the mind comes to reflect on its own operations about the ideas got by sensation, and thereby stores itself with a new set of ideas, which I call *ideas of reflection.* These impressions that are made on our senses by objects *extrinsical* to the mind; and *its own operations proceeding from powers* INTRINSICAL *and* PROPER *to itself* (which, when reflected on by itself, become also objects of its contemplation), are, as I have said, *the original of all knowledge.*'

Now, suppose it were granted for argument's sake, that in these passages Locke has used the word 'reflection' very improperly; that, according to Cousin, he ought to have used 'consciousness' instead; that he has even used it in senses which no one word would represent, — sometimes for consciousness in general, sometimes for the reflex acts by which we analyse it; — suppose further that, according to the same critic, Locke's entire method is wrong in first entering on the dark question as to the origin of our knowledge, instead of determining what are the actual products of thought in the maturely developed consciousness; that he is wrong, according to the same philosopher, in postponing, by a distinct interval, the phenomena of 'reflection' to those of 'sensation;' instead of regarding them as simultaneous, and, in some degree or other, as reciprocally involved from the very first; — suppose further, if you please, that in expressing his belief that in 'experience all our knowledge is 'founded,' he is inconsistent with himself even in the above-cited passages, (though we have little doubt that Locke would have recoiled from the sensational interpretation of that phrase, as strongly as Aristotle, from any similar interpretation put on the words often attributed to *him*, 'that there is nothing in the 'intellect but what was previously in the sense')*; be all this true, still it cannot surely be denied that the above sentences, in a manner quite independent of any or of all these deficiencies of analysis or inconsistencies of expression, declare Locke's belief, that not from *one* source or fountain, but from TWO is all our knowledge derived; and that the latter of the two is *as* distinct

* In truth the position of Aristotle seems to us singularly like that of Locke in this matter; for though, as Sir William Hamilton remarks, the above current saying is not literally his, he has used phraseology and imagery, which are nearly tantamount; and if such expressions, which, like Locke's similar utterance, are susceptible of two senses, be made to overbear those many other passages which are as plainly susceptible of only *one*, Aristotle too is chargeable with patronising the sensational schools.

—whatever his inadequate, or, if you please, inaccurate, investigation of it—as sensation itself.

'The expressions which Locke employs,' says the objector, 'are 'ambiguous. Locke says that all our ideas are derived from "ex- '"perience." Did he mean by experience, "sensible experience," 'and if so, did he mean that that experience is the *occasion* on 'which the powers of reflection are excited, developed, mani- 'fested,—the universal condition on which they are evolved, and 'without which the activities of mind are suspended and slumber 'in the germ? or did he mean that experience is in such a 'manner, and so exclusively, the source of the materials of our 'knowledge, that reflection adds nothing to them of its own, but 'merely modifies them? If the last, he must be supposed to trace 'all knowledge to *one* source; and it may be fairly urged, that as 'some of his expressions are ambiguous, they may mean either.' They *might* have done so, we reply, *if* the expressions above cited, and many others, had not determined the point. The words show that he did *not* mean by experience merely 'sen- 'sible' experience, and that he *did* mean that there are *two* independent fountains, and not *one* of all our knowledge. We feel that we cannot, without injustice, interpret those expressions, which are in all fairness susceptible only of a single plain meaning, by others which are as obviously susceptible of different meanings. For if it be true, in *any* sense, (as it assuredly is) that experience, as human nature is constituted, is an invariable *condition* of the evolution of any and of all mental activity, then we *can* comprehend the meaning of the expressions by which Locke refers all knowledge to 'experience'; whereas, we cannot explain his explicit assertions of *two* distinct sources of our knowledge, 'sensation' and 'reflection'—the last, as he says, furnishing us with ideas which could not be referred to sense, unless he regarded these sources as perfectly distinct and independent. Thus, we apprehend, may Locke's statement be reconciled with the assertion, that all our knowledge originates in 'experience.'

Even in the more limited sense of the word 'experience,' as restricted to sensible experience, the assertion that all our knowledge is ultimately derived from it as an inseparable *condition*, would still be true. It is true that God could, for aught we know, and that in an unlimited variety of ways, have made the energies of the human spirit, its modes of activity, the intellectual products of that activity, dependent upon other conditions than those of sensation; or, for aught we know, on no conditions external to itself at all, though not, of course, independent of experience in that more comprehensive sense, (as includ-

ing the mind's conscious activity,) in which we think Locke's language shows that he used the term. But God has not in fact done so; at present, as men in *this* world are constituted, no matter what other creatures may be in other worlds, or what we may be hereafter, some contact with the external world must be effected, some avenue to sense must be opened, before the mind awakens to any activity at all—before thought germinates —before what is potential and virtual becomes actual. The analogy of the grain of wheat, germinating only after its being dropped into the soil, represents the dependence of the human mind for its development on a free exposure to the conditions of its activity. But that which makes the plant different from other plants, that which gives it a distinct development, must be sought in the internal structure and properties of the seed itself; true though it be, that those properties would never have been developed at all, except by this exposure to the conditions of development, arbitrary, if you please to think so, but still invariably supposed. These conditions are susceptible of an infinite variety of modifications, according to the character of the faculty or faculties they are to awaken; but still, of some kind and to *some* extent, they are indispensable.

There being, then, an intelligible sense in which it is true that for the actual manifestation of any of the activities of the mind we are dependent on experience, as an indispensable condition, it is possible to understand the language of Locke, as the correspondent language of Aristotle, without attributing to him the doctrine of the sensational school, or anything which fairly implies it. On the other hand, we repeat, it is *not* possible to give any interpretation of those numberless passages in which he so distinctly affirms his belief that there are *two* different fountains of our ideas—sensation and reflection, on the hypothesis that he really resolves them into *one*. If A. and B. be two propositions, whereof A. is susceptible of two interpretations, of which one is contradictory to B., while B. admits of but one, what propriety can there be, or rather what injustice must there not be, in assuming that an author means *that* one of the two senses of A. which is contradictory to B., and which in fact, by the very assertion of B., he has virtually disclaimed?

It seems to us strange, after the criticism of Dugald Stewart (and the citations by which he had confirmed it) in his admirable 'Dissertation on the Progress of Metaphysical Science,' that it should be necessary to resume the question. Yet so it is; for charges substantially identical with those of Stillingfleet and Shaftesbury are still urged in other forms; it is still asserted, and has been very recently, that Locke has virtually resolved all our

knowledge into one source—that of sensible experience. It cannot, indeed, be justly said that M. Cousin affirms this; for he fairly admits that Locke does concede *two* distinct sources of knowledge; yet he often speaks just as though he had forgotten it. He affirms that the whole tendency of Locke's philosophy is sensational, and expresses no surprise at the extravagancies to which the sensationalists of France pushed it; rather he regards him as their veritable patron, and their systems not as corruptions of Locke's system, but a justifiable extension of it; in fact, thinks that Locke, if consistent, ought to have carried it to similar conclusions, and that he refrained, only because he did not see the consistent termination of his own speculations. He says*, 'Locke is the father of the whole sensualistic school of 'the eighteenth century. He is incontestably, in time as well as 'in genius, the first metaphysician *of this school.*' And at the close of the preceding lecture, he says, Locke is the earliest of the sensualistic metaphysicians of the eighteenth century. He it is who produced all the others, and who furnished for his successors the very subjects with which they were occupied. 'It is true' (Lecture xvii.), Locke 'has not confounded sensation and the 'faculties of the soul; he very explicitly distinguishes them: 'but he makes our faculties play a secondary and insignificant 'part, and he concentrates their action upon sensible data; 'hence to confound them with sensibility was but a step; and 'in his philosophy was already deposited the yet feeble germ of 'the future theory of "transformed sensations,"—*of sensation* '*as the sole principle of all the operations of the soul.* It was 'Locke, who without *knowing it* and *without willing it*, opened 'the road to that exclusive doctrine, by adding to sensation 'only faculties whose *whole office* is to act upon it, without any 'proper and original power.'

The predisposition to find everywhere the germs of the yet future sensational schools in Locke as their fountain head, often leads M. Cousin, as we cannot but think, into extreme injustice to our great countryman. This we are far from attributing to any unworthy spirit of depreciation, for M. Cousin often gives frank expression to his admiration of Locke's sagacity and genius. As little can we impute it to ignorance, for he has evidently studied the great work of Locke diligently, and cites him profusely; we can attribute it only to what is but too apt to adhere to the critic and historian of philosophy—the spirit of system. Having laid it down that the roots of the sensational schools were to be found in Locke's writings, he unconsciously perverts

* Lecture xv.

or exaggerates whatsoever seems to favour that hypothesis. The apparent ambiguities of Locke, the laxity of his style and phraseology, are freely submitted to the most extreme pressure; no adequate attempt (the only fair course of criticism in such cases) is made to collate apparent inconsistencies and take the mean of the expressions thus examined; all such seeming inconsistencies, now and then simply two *different* solutions of the same question, are at once set down, without any such preliminary trouble, as contradictions—of which he is represented as perpetually guilty. Nor is this all; in apparently discrepant passages, the obscure is taken as of equal value with the plain, instead of allowing the latter to explain the former; and lastly, in not a few instances Locke's meaning is strangely misconceived into exactly the opposite of what he has both meant and said in the clearest possible manner. Of all this we shall presently have occasion to give some instances.*

Such sentences as these are of too frequent occurrence. 'I 'have told you,—I shall very often repeat it,—nothing is so in- 'consistent as Locke in his "Essay"; contradictions exist not only 'from book to book, but in the same book from chapter to chapter, 'and almost from paragraph to paragraph!' This of course must be received *cum grano*—or rather with many grains; for if it were true that *such* a mind as Locke's could not help thus reeling in one drunken fit through two octavo volumes; or that such a mind as Cousin's could not but *fancy* that he was thus drunk though he was not, people will be inclined to say: 'Let us fly 'for ever from this hideous Circean shore of metaphysics, where 'the greatest and the clearest minds either cannot understand 'themselves, or cannot express themselves so as to be understood 'by others, or, lastly, can neither understand themselves nor be 'understood by others.'

M. Cousin himself, in frankly admitting that Locke clearly admits two sources of our knowledge, and not one only, and that there *is* a sense in which Locke's statement, that all our knowledge is ultimately derived from experience, is true, had it in his power to resolve a vast number of those seeming inconsistencies and ambiguities on which he lays such stress, without

* We wish M. Cousin, in a new edition of his Lectures, would ponder the judgment of Sir W. Hamilton. 'In his *language*,'—the italics are his own—'Locke is of all philosophers the most figurative, 'ambiguous, vacillating, various, and even contradictory. . . . . 'The opinions of such a writer are not, therefore, to be assumed from 'isolated and casual expressions, which themselves *require to be in- 'terpreted on the general analogy of his system.*' (*Discussion, &c.* p. 76.) M. Cousin's 'Lectures on Locke' are well worth a careful revision.

charging him with perpetual confusion and contradiction. M. Cousin himself clearly apprehends and most beautifully illustrates the necessity of admitting *two* elements, both requisite to be insisted on, and each complementary to the other, in the attempt to give a complete account of the contents of the human intellect;—one more particularly dwelt upon by Locke and the other by Kant; and never was M. Cousin's catholic eclecticism more reasonably resorted to. For example, he shows that in the idea of pure space, the idea of body obtained by the senses, is a necessary condition of its evolution, since without sensation, we should not, according to our present constitution, have any idea of space at all; but he also shows, on the other hand, that the very instant in which we gain from sensation the idea of body as extended, the correlative conception of space as a *necessary* condition of the existence of body is also obtained; so that as the idea of space *now* presents itself, we are compelled, by the very constitution of our laws of thought, to regard it as the anterior condition of any conception of the existence of body; though it be true that we should not without sensation have had any notion of body at all, nor *therefore* of space. The one he calls the 'logical' condition of the conception of space; and the other the 'chronological' condition of the same notion, as dependent, in point of time, on the prior sensations by which the existence of body is notified to us. Nothing can be clearer than M. Cousin's frequent statement of these two conditions in the actual formation of many of our fundamental notions; nor any thing more beautiful than his illustration of the mode in which, in fact, the representations of Locke and Kant may be reconciled; but then since they *can* be thus reconciled, we contend that the due recollection of this would have afforded the key to many of the alleged contradictions which M. Cousin charges upon Locke.

If M. Cousin had merely said that Locke had been so intent on illustrating the one aspect of the subject that he had given very disproportionate attention to the other; that the origin of all our ideas in sensational conditions had been disproportionally insisted upon, and that the ratio of the other element, though admitted, was not adequately estimated, we could have heartily gone with him. But in his resolute effort to make Locke the responsible head of the sensational schools, M. Cousin has gone far beyond this; and in many cases done him grievous injustice. We shall presently give examples in the interpretation of Locke's notions of space, duration, substance, and power. Somebody said of Bentley, that he was such a sagacious critic that the 'text of Horace was not corrupt enough for him.' The reader of

M. Cousin might almost be tempted to think that he himself thought the same of Locke. We hope we shall not be misunderstood, however; we really think M. Cousin's 'Lectures on Locke' of very great merit: they abound in specimens of really very refined analysis, and admirable clearness of expression. The parts of the lectures on John Locke which are the best, are those (and they are many) which are *not* on John Locke — if we may thus paradoxically express it. But before saying more of M. Cousin's lectures, we shall resume the question of the fundamental principles of Locke's philosophy, and just bring into one view the several indications which by fair implication corroborate the interpretation already put on the passages we have cited from his essay, and which, in our judgment, absolve him from any charge of patronising the Hartleys or Condillacs of a subsequent period.

1. The admissions of Locke even in his celebrated First Book, in which he is combating the supposed 'innate ideas' of nobody knows exactly who, (for probably nobody since the world began ever literally held the doctrine he refutes,) are in fact enough; his very admission of the possession of such and such a *constitution* of the human faculties, by which it becomes possessed of the maxims which he denies to be innate (rightly enough in *his* sense), and by which it comes to apprehend the very notions which are the subjects of dispute, and not other or different ones, does virtually decide the question. His distinct appeal to 'common sense,' in the very same book, yet more formally shows, as Sir W. Hamilton observes, that if he ever intended to contend for the extreme view so often attributed to him, he abandons even while he states it.*

2. Similarly, Locke's constant and expressly declared distinction between necessary and contingent truth ought to decide in behalf of the more favourable interpretation of him; for to what else than an internal source of thought can any who *do* admit our possession of necessary truths (those who *deny* any such truths may take another course) attribute their origination? Such notions, on the hypothesis that there are such in the mind, must evidently be the product of the mind's own constitution; for though experience may be the condition of their evolution, it

* 'He would be thought,' says Locke, 'void of *common sense*, who asked on the one side, or on the other went to give a reason, why it is impossible for the same thing to be and not to be?' On this Sir William remarks, 'In other words, common sense or intellect, as the source, is the guarantee of the principle of contradiction. There is here a confession, the importance of which has been observed neither by Locke nor his antagonists.' (*Hamilton's Reid*, Appendix, A. p. 784.)

can never prove them.* The sharp and trenchant manner in which Locke distinguishes between men and brutes in his chapter on 'discerning,' &c. (B. II. ch. xi). — denying to the latter all approach to the faculty of abstraction, in a way, perhaps, to which some brutes or some advocates of brutes might demur, — furnishes collateral proof that Locke did not mean to exclude the intellect itself as a distinct source of ideas. Animals, we have reason to believe, both from our own observation, and from analogous structure, as far as their senses are concerned, have the same sensations as we have. How is it that they never arrive at the same results from them? Because it will be said, they have not the same *faculties* that we possess, though they may have the same sensations. Exactly so; that is, it is the faculties to which these phenomena are submitted — alike in the pig and the man—that determine and limit the results; it is owing to man's intellect being so and so conditioned, and not his sensations. How is it that animals never derive out of those sensational conditions which are common to both, those necessary truths which men do, or at least, *think* they do? for even *that* is enough to show the difference in question, as well as the cause of it. How is it that a pig, as he looks on the fields and sees them always green, or on the skies, if he ever lifts his queer eyes there, and sees them always blue, never troubles his head with any question of cause; nor extracts out of *some* of his uniformities of experience, what man calls necessary truths, and acknowledges that other experiences equally uniform, tell him only of contingent truths? Perhaps a pure sensationalist might say, 'and the pig is all the wiser; for there are no such 'necessary truths, they are a pure delusion.' Very well, we should reply; as to the first point, there is no disputing about tastes; and as to the second, even supposing the 'delusion,' the delusion itself shows whence it comes, that is, from the internal character of the intellect itself. But at all events, and *à fortiori*, he who admits these necessary truths, and that they are *not* delusions (as was the case with Locke) can hardly be supposed to deny that the intellect itself is, from its very structure, an independent source of ideas. Never otherwise shall we account for the fact that man makes so different a use in different cases of similar *uniform* phenomena — the very same invariable experience; turning it, in one case, into a source of what he deems a necessary and universal truth, and declining to pronounce any-

* Leibnitz has remarked in his 'Nouveaux Essais' that the admission of necessary truths does, in fact, concede the point apparently contested, and hence, as also on other grounds, thinks he sees that the differences between himself and Locke are not irreconcilable.

thing of the kind in another. He sees two lines which intersect, and he is willing everywhere to stake his life that they will never meet again, and never enclose a space; he sees the snow is always white, and yet he will not dare to say that it might not have been of any or of all the colours of the rainbow; or if he denies it, does so in virtue of a principle which he borrows not from sense at all, but from a presumed necessary law of interconnection between the internal structure and external qualities of objects, of which law sense and experience tell him nothing, nay, of which the philosopher now generally admits that sense and experience never did or can tell him anything; these certifying to him nothing but invariable coexistence in phenomena, or, invariable antecedence and sequence in the order of succession. Out of some of these invariable antecedents and consequents man derives what he calls necessary truths, and is everywhere willing to stake his existence that truths they can never cease to be; as to others, equally invariable to his experience, he will not pledge sixpence that the facts hold in any other world than this;—all this is undeniable. The distinction may or may not be thought delusive; but once more we say that he who thinks it no delusion, he who admits the existence of such necessary and universal truths, ought not to be lightly charged with making all knowledge dependent on sense and experience in any other sense than that these are an invariable *condition* of the evolution of any and of all mental activity.

3. We think the same conclusion *ought* to be inferred from Locke's favourite argument for the existence of God, which he declares to be best proved from the mind itself; not indeed in the form of Descartes' celebrated argument from the very idea of such a Being (which he confutes), but still from the consciousness of our own existence. Here the idea of cause and effect is clearly involved as an original and fundamental law of thought, and its activity represented as awakened purely by the intervention of internal phenomena. His strongest statement on the subject may be found in a remarkable fragment published in Lord King's life. After refuting Descartes' celebrated paradox, and showing that the mind has no warrant for believing in the objective existence of an idea merely because we have it, he says, 'The real existence of other things without us can be 'evidenced to us only by our senses; but our own existence is 'known to us by a certainty yet higher than our senses can give 'us of the existence of other things, and that is internal percep-'tion, a self-consciousness, or intuition; from whence, there-'fore, may be drawn, *by a train of ideas, the surest and most 'incontestable proof of the existence of a God.*'

4. But perhaps the clearest collateral proof of Locke's never having dreamt of patronising the great dogma of the sensational school may be found in his Letters to Stillingfleet; and we wonder that those remarkable productions have not been more frequently cited in the criticism of Locke. It is true, indeed, that they are rather tedious in form, because Locke has honestly followed the worthy Bishop paragraph by paragraph, and almost sentence by sentence. All such *honest* polemical pieces are apt to be tedious. Probably very few of the ordinary students of Locke ever read more of these letters than the citations from them, appended as footnotes to the common editions of the 'Essay on the Understanding;' and yet they must be carefully studied if any one would impartially consider Locke's true relations to the subsequent sensational schools. Thus he again and again declares his belief that, in reality, the excellent prelate's 'certainty by principles of reason' does not, except in name, contradict his own theory; he admits, that though he does not concede maxims as *innate* in his sense, yet that the mind is so constituted, that it is '*repugnant* to our conceptions' that we should not think so and so. He admits this especially in relation to our idea of *substance*, which had been so much litigated between them, and which Stillingfleet charged him with having 'banished out of the rational world,' because he had affirmed that it is only an obscure notion we have of it.

What Locke says in the Essay on the subject of 'Intuition' does, as Sir W. Hamilton has observed, involve, in effect, the concession of the principles Locke has been supposed to deny. This critic says, 'What Locke here (in the passage of the first book, already referred to,) 'calls "common sense," he elsewhere, 'by another ordinary synonyme, denominates Intuition.' Accordingly in the controversy with Stillingfleet, he again and again refers to what he has written on Intuition as justifying his belief that at bottom there is no difference between the Bishop's 'way of certainty by reason,' or 'the way of certainty by prin-'ciples of reason,' as Stillingfleet terms it, and 'the way of cer-'tainty by ideas,' as he styles that of Locke. Two or three brief extracts will show how sincerely Locke thought that there was no radical difference between his views and those of his opponent.

'The understanding as a faculty,' he says, (in reply to an objection that he had not treated of reason in all the senses he had himself assigned it), 'being the subject of my Essay, it carried me to treat directly of reason *no otherwise than as a faculty.* But yet reason, as standing for *true and clear principles*, and also as standing for clear and fair deductions from those principles, I have not wholly omitted;

as is manifest from what I have said of self-evident propositions, intuitive knowledge, and demonstration in other parts of my essay.*

He emphatically reminds his opponent of what he had said in the Essay, of self-evident propositions, 'That whether they 'come in view of the mind *earlier or later*, this is true of them, 'that they are all known by their native evidence, are wholly 'independent, receive no light, nor are capable of any proof one 'from another;' and vehemently complains that Stillingfleet had grossly misrepresented his meaning, by misquoting this passage.† If it be said that Locke places *all* self-evident propositions on the same footing, at whatever period they are seen to be so, and asserts that if all such be called 'maxims' in the sense of those who pleaded for innate ideas, there will be plenty of such 'maxims'—this does not affect the principle of his admission; it may be, as doubtless it is, an instance of defective analysis; but his admission clearly concedes the point that the laws of the mind itself impose upon us ultimate principles of thought, which are evident by their native light, can derive none from without or from one another, and are the bases of all demonstration. He merely denies that any such self-evident propositions are 'innate' in the sense attached to them in his first book, — that chimera against which he is always superfluously guarding.

Accordingly, having told his opponent, in his Second Reply, that he could see no opposition between what the Bishop calls 'the method of certainty by ideas,' and the 'method of certainty 'by reason,' he reiterates it, after having perused Stillingfleet's rejoinder. He says, 'I crave leave to say, that if by prin-'ciples and maxims, your Lordship means all self-evident pro-'positions, our ways are even in this part the same; for as you 'know, my Lord, I make self-evident propositions necessary to 'certainty, and found all certainty only in them.' ‡

But perhaps the passages in which he speaks of the ideas of 'cause' and 'substance' in the same controversy, most clearly evince the substantial identity of his sentiments with those of his opponent. In speaking of the necessity of such notions, and of the repugnancy to the nature of the mind, that we should not arrive at them, his language may well satisfy even M. Cousin, that Leibnitz was right in surmising that the differences

* Vol. iii. p. 424.

† Ibid. p. 400. He exhibits in parallel columns his own words and the bishop's paraphrase. The whole context is well worth considering.

‡ Ibid. p. 421.

between Locke and himself were not irreconcilable. He affirms the principle of causality in terms very similar to those of M. Cousin, in the lecture in which he charges Locke with ignoring it*; while the language in which he declares that it is repugnant to our conceptions that modes and properties should not involve the idea of substance — though we have no clear or distinct idea of substance — is, as Locke himself says, identical with Stillingfleet's own. We subjoin two or three brief passages: —

'Every thing that has a beginning must have "a cause" is a true principle of reason, or a proposition certainly true; which we come to know by the same way, *i. e.* by contemplating our ideas, and perceiving that the idea of beginning to be is *necessarily* connected with the idea of some operation; and the idea of operation with the idea of something operating, which we call a *cause;* and so the beginning to be is perceived to agree with the idea of a cause, as is expressed in the proposition, and thus it comes to be a certain proposition; and so may be called a principle of reason even as every true proposition is to him that perceives the certainty of it. . . . . This, my Lord, is my way of ideas, and of coming to a certainty by them; which, when your Lordship has again considered, *I am apt to think your Lordship will no more condemn, than I do except against your Lordship's way of arguments or principles of reason.*' (Locke's Works, vol. iii. pp. 60, 61.)

'Whether the general idea of substance be one of the first or most natural ideas in our minds, I will not dispute with your lordship, as not being, I think, very material to the matter in hand. But as to the idea of substance, what it is, and how we come by it, your Lordship says, it is a repugnancy to our conceptions of things, that modes and accidents should subsist by themselves; and, therefore, we *must* conceive a *substratum* wherein they are.

'And, *I* say, "because we *cannot* conceive how simple ideas of "sensible qualities should subsist alone, or in one another, we suppose "them existing in and supported by some common subject;" which I with your Lordship call also *substratum.*

'What can be more consonant to itself than what your Lordship and I have said in these two passages is consonant to one another? Whereupon, my Lord, give me leave, I beseech you, to boast to the world, that what I have said concerning our general idea of substance and the way how we come by it, has the honour to be confirmed by your Lordship's authority.'

He repeats the same conviction at a subsequent page.† The following sentence, too, is tolerably significant; and the figure employed reminds one of those which have so often been resorted to by subsequent writers to illustrate the relation between the laws of the mind and the external conditions of their

* Lecture, xix. † Vol. iii. p. 445.

activity, as necessary to the evolution of all our cognitions: — 'Nothing truer than that it is not the idea that makes us certain without reason or without the understanding; but it is as 'true that it is not reason, it is not the understanding, that 'makes us certain without ideas. It is not the sun makes me 'certain it is day without my eyes; nor it is not my sight makes 'me certain it is day without the sun; but the one employed 'about the other.'*

Lastly, we think that similar conclusions should, in fairness, be gathered from Locke's frequent and distinct admisson of a law of immutable morality, founded on the constitution of human nature — a law which, on similar grounds to those which have led to the parallel objections we have been considering, he has been erroneously supposed to call in question. Dugald Stewart clearly shows, in answer to the temperate strictures of Beattie, that there are passages in the 'Essay' which prove any such interpretation to be unjust, and cites, among others, the one in which Locke speaks of a '*Law of Nature*, as intelligible to a '*rational creature and studier of that law*, as the positive laws of 'commonwealths.'

But many passages still stronger are to be found in his 'Reasonableness of Christianity,' and in his 'Commentary on 'Paul's Epistles.' The former work, whatever its doctrinal deficiencies, proves distinctly enough that Locke was both theologically and philosophically orthodox on the point in question. Thus, speaking of the universal moral law, he calls it † 'that 'eternal law of right which is holy, just, and good; of which 'no one precept or rule is abrogated or repealed; nor indeed 'can be, whilst God is an holy, just, and righteous God, and 'man a rational creature. The duties of that law, *arising from 'the constitution of his very nature*, are of eternal obligation; 'nor can it be taken away or dispensed with, *without changing 'the nature of things*, overturning the measures of right and 'wrong, and thereby introducing and authorising irregularity, 'confusion, and disorder in the world.' He shows the same in a subsequent part of the work, though he at the same time insists that, 'however agreeable to the nature of man' the principles of ethical truth may be, they had not, for whatever reason, received a uniform and symmetrical development; and that hence may be shown the utility of a precise and authoritative revelation.

We cannot but think that an attentive perusal of these writings of Locke would have materially altered Cousin's degrading estimate of Locke's ethical principles given in his twentieth lecture.

---

* Vol. iii. pp. 59, 60. † Vol. vi. p. 112.

If there are many who think that Locke really adopts the fundamental principle of the sensational schools, there is, at all events, a phalanx of eminent critics who contend that this can be affirmed only by perverting what Locke has said, or in consequence of his own failure adequately to express what he meant to say. We can claim as his compurgators Dugald Stewart, Brown, Reid, and Sir W. Hamilton. Nor is it uninstructive to see how much more decidedly Dugald Stewart speaks in his 'Dissertation' than in his 'Philosophical Essays.' The first was published six years after the second; and when a very careful survey of the whole subject, with a view expressly to the history of metaphysical science, had qualified him for uttering a judicial opinion. Nor have sensationalists been wanting who have acknowledged that Locke can be their patron only by obliterating an essential feature of his system. 'It appears to me,' says Hartley, drolly imagining that he was improving (as Dugald Stewart says) on Locke's theory, 'that all the most complex ideas arise from 'sensation, and that reflection is not a distinct source, as Mr. 'Locke makes it.'

Leibnitz, one of the most strenuous defenders of the theory of 'innate ideas,' not indeed in the sense in which Locke denies them, but in the sense of innate 'capacities,' or fundamental laws of thought, and whose emendation of the saying 'There is nothing in the intellect but what was in the sense,' (to which he added, 'except the intellect itself,') has passed into epigrammatic notoriety, has clearly apprehended, as we think, that Locke's view is at bottom not irreconcilable with his own. He at once admits that such innate ideas as those which Locke protests against, have no existence; but at the same time contends, in our view most justly, that Locke's distinct admission of a *second* and *independent* source of ideas in reflection, really bridged over the apparent chasm between them. Thus he speaks in the 'Avant-propos' to his work on Locke's Essay; 'Il est vrai qu'il ne faut point s'imaginer qu'on puisse lire 'dans l'âme ces éternelles lois de la raison à livre ouvert, 'comme l'edit du Preteur se lit sur son *album* sans peine et 'sans recherche; mais c'est assez qu'on les puisse decouvrir 'en nous à force d'attention, à quoi les occasions sont fournies 'par les sens. . . . Peut-être que nôtre habile auteur ne 's'éloignera pas entièrement de mon sentiment. Car après 'avoir employé tout son premier livre à rejetter les lumières 'innées, *prises dans un certain sens*, il avoue pourtant au com-'mencement au second et dans la suite, que les idées, qui n'ont 'point leur origine dans la sensation, viennent de la reflection. 'Or, la reflection n'est autre chose qu'une attention à ce qui est

'en nous, et les sens ne nous donnent point ce que nous portons 'deja avec nous.'* In the character of Theophile (his own pseudonym in the Dialogue) he gives expression to the same conviction.

The similar decision of so competent a critic as Sir W. Hamilton is well worth noting. 'Had Descartes and Locke 'expressed themselves with due precision, the latter would not 'so have misunderstood the former, and both would have been 'found in harmony with each other and with truth.'†

Of Locke's First Book (generally admitted to be inferior to the rest) it can only be said, that if anybody did or does—and many disciples of Descartes and Herbert often expressed themselves as if they did—hold innate ideas in the sense there explained, Locke thoroughly explodes the theory. At the same time, we certainly have our doubts whether anybody ever did hold 'innate 'ideas' in the sense supposed, and whether the language which seems to imply them, were not the mere consequence of a want of clearness of conception. We have already observed, that men who enunciate great truths often content themselves with a rude metaphorical or analogical approximation to exact expression, the inadequacy of which they would readily admit if they could anticipate that their successors would interpret them with literal rigour.

It has been ingeniously surmised by Hallam, that there may be a doubt whether Locke in this first book does really refer to Descartes at all. It is certain that he never mentions his name; it is equally certain that if he had read all that Descartes has said on the subject, and especially the passages adduced in our recent article on Descartes‡, he ought to have seen that it was not fair to suppose the French philosopher to plead for the chimeras he ridicules. It is not improbable, certainly, that Locke had chiefly in his eye, some who had expressed themselves more laxly and inconsistently than Descartes, probably some of his followers: perhaps Lord Herbert, whose expressions are often undoubtedly very strong. If Locke *was* referring to Descartes, it may be considered a curious retribution for thus in the first book straining the French philosopher's phraseology, that his own in the second book has been as much strained against himself; that as he has supposed Descartes to believe in the existence of innate ideas, inscribed, so to speak, on the substance of the soul, so his own opponents represented him as deny-

* Nouveaux Essais. 4to. pp. 5—7.
† Appendix to Reid, A. Art. 50.
‡ Edinburgh Review, Jan. 1852.

ing that any of the modifications of thought are due to any source but sensation. It is an instructive example, not only of the difficulty of writing on metaphysical subjects so as to guard against misapprehension, but of the necessity of using the utmost caution as well as candour in interpreting the language of those we criticise.

Whatever Locke thought or did not think, it is surely time that the ancient controversy on this subject, which has lasted from the Theætetus of Plato to the Lectures of Cousin, should cease. The expenditure of thought, and toil, and print upon it has been enormous; more than enough has been surely written to indicate how it should be settled; or if not, it may be feared that it is among the questions which will never be settled. In that case, it would be well at all events to sign a truce, and not allow so large a portion of the energies of mental philosophers to expend themselves on the *origin* of our knowledge, for many of them are so arrested here that they seem never fairly to get *beyond* the origin. They are rocking the cradle of our notions all their days. Neither is it well that the student should be so continually detained in this dark vestibule of science.—But in truth the controversy has been brought to that pass by perpetual sifting and discussion, that it may be hoped that something far better than even a truce may be looked for. The combatants no longer look exclusively on the same side of the shield; nor, which were hardly more wise, more frequently or more intently on the one side than on the other. If ever 'Eclecticism' in philosophy, which is apt to be regarded with much the same suspicion as a Coalition Ministry, be desirable and practicable, it is assuredly here. There is every reason, indeed, why philosophers should unite; for with the exception of a few mystics on the one side, who would make each human soul little short of an 'inspired oracle' to itself, and so emancipate it from the vulgar necessities of instruction and experience altogether, and a few extravagant sensationalists on the other, who would make man little better than a sort of superior hog, all parties are pretty well agreed in the admission of the conjoint, inseparably blended, and equally indispensable elements and conditions, internal and external, involved in the development of the human mind and in the origin of all our knowledge. It is not so much, now-a-days, by denying the necessity of either class of conditions, as by asserting for the other more than is justly due, and exaggerating their relative claims, that philosophers differ. And it is precisely here, that if not a truce, yet at least a wise forbearance is necessary; for if philosophers are now agreed, as we imagine they are pretty well, in

their principles, they may afford to differ about the details; the conjoint influences on which our knowledge depends, coming into play at a time and in modes when the mind is incapable of distinctly tracing its own acts, and the result of the mysterious process being already complete before the analysis begins. This result, like a product of chemical affinities, is as different from the elements which enter into it as the hyacinth from the bulb or the soil whose conjoint influence produced it; or as a diamond from the elements out of which it was mysteriously manufactured in the darkness of the mine. As M. Cousin well puts it, 'La pensée est un fleuve qu'on ne remonte pas aisément; 'sa source, comme celle du Nil, est un mystère.'*

These considerations ought surely to restrict the details of the dispute to reasonable limits; since, if those details are incapable of being determined with such precision as to satisfy different minds (which seems probable alike both from the nature of the questions and the experience of the history of philosophy), it is pure waste of time and toil to renew at every stage this ancient strife.

But there is yet a stronger reason for wishing that philosophers may cordially join their forces in asserting the principles which the long polemics of the subject have now pretty generally established. The question, whether many of our purely speculative maxims be more due to experience or to the fundamental laws of belief, is, after all, a matter of comparatively little practical moment; if the controversy be pursued beyond a certain point, the result will simply be a loss of time to the philosopher, and perhaps to the unhappy reader of his subtleties a loss of patience; but the notions themselves, and their practical results, will not be affected by any theory. The case, however, is widely different with regard to those more remote or more obscure notions, involving theological or moral truth, which depend on a sedulous attention to *both* the essential conditions of the normal development of the human mind. In relation to these, any undue aggrandisement, either of the doctrine of intuitive beliefs or the influence of external experience, of which education and culture are but an extension, or rather one of the forms, is attended with the most pernicious results. The moment men begin to take up with either idea to the exclusion of the other, they are capable of running into the most extravagant errors, and ignore at once the importance of one of the essential complements of human development. Thus the advocate on one side is apt to say, 'the idea of God is a primary

* Seizième Leçon.

'intuition of the human mind: all men have it, none are without it, and it is essentially one and the same in all.' What says M. Cousin, in reference to Locke's statement, that the argument for the being of God from 'universal consent' is in strict truth an argument from an immense *majority*, (the force of which Locke says he does not deny)? 'I deny,' says M. Cousin, 'that there are people who have no idea of a God; 'and here the Cartesian philosophy and all idealistic philosophy 'takes sure ground, proving beyond reply, that the idea of 'God being at bottom, that of the infinite, of perfection, of 'unity, and of absolute existence, *cannot but be found in every 'man whose reason is ever so little developed.*' We can only say that we are very happy to hear it; we thought that in France at least, there were some few who denied any such idea, though their intellect is *not* 'a little developed.'* We can but say with Locke to Stillingfleet, 'I would crave leave to ask your 'Lordship, was there ever in the world an atheist or not? if 'not, what need is there of raising a question about the being 'of God, when nobody questions it? What need of provisional 'arguments against a fault from which mankind are so wholly 'free, and which by a universal consent they may be presumed 'to be secure from?' In this case, by virtue of assuming not only that there are fundamental laws of human thought, but that

* It is curious that some of the more recent advocates of innate laws of thought have pleaded for a more *normal* operation of them than the elder and, as has been often supposed, more rigid champions of 'innate ideas' would contend for. Thus we have just seen that Leibnitz says, 'that it is sufficient to suppose,' not that they necessarily manifest themselves, but that 'they can be discovered by an 'effort of attention, on occasions offered by the senses.' Descartes, in a curious passage in one of his letters, in which he expresses his surprise at the absurd interpretation put on his theory of 'innate 'ideas,' says even of that of a Deity, 'Although the idea of God is 'imprinted on our minds in such a sense that every person has 'within himself the *faculty* of *knowing him*, it does not follow that 'there may not have been many individuals *who have passed through 'life without ever making this idea a distinct object of apprehen-'sion.*' It were hard to discover any radical difference between such sentiments and those of Locke, who says, 'From the consideration 'of ourselves, *and what we infallibly find in our own constitutions*, 'our reason leads us to the knowledge of this certain and evident 'truth. . . . I presume I may say that we more certainly know that 'there is a God than that there is anything else *without* us. When 'I say we know, I mean there is such a knowledge within our reach, 'which we cannot miss, if we will but apply our minds to it. . . . .' (B. iv. ch. 10.)

they must take a normal development, undue stress is laid on that rudimentary impression of a Deity of which even he who worships a cat, a monkey, or a block of stone, is not wholly destitute; and men are apt to under-estimate the necessity of that careful and just culture by which alone this cardinal truth can admit of complete extrication and a just development. It is forgotten that the want of that development makes all the difference between an ennobling and elevating idea of God, and one of which not only Locke, but many more would say, that they question whether it would not be as well to be without it altogether.

Again, the advocate on the same side is apt to say, 'The principles of morals are universal; no nations are so savage, none so barbarous that some glimmering of moral truth, and some sentiment of social duty, are not to be found among them.' It is granted; but the world notwithstanding affords too abundant proof, in the variety of deflections to which conscience is subject, — extending even to the absolute inversion of some moral principles, the transformation of virtues into vices and of vices into virtues, the consecration, among many nations, of the most hideous enormities, — that apart from a sedulous and just culture of the moral nature so vaunted, there is scarcely any limit to the degree in which that flexible nature may be bent and perverted by association and habit and early misinstruction. If it is said that there is no nation that has inverted the *entire* moral code, thus bearing witness to the presence of certain great moral principles and tendencies in the human mind, this is quite true; but it is equally true, first, that neither has there ever been a nation without some species of education, calculated in some degree to develop the moral faculty; since the very circumstances in which all mankind are placed, their instincts, and their mutual necessities and relations, involve from the earliest periods of childhood a species of training for the development of the moral sentiments; and secondly, that notwithstanding all this, the hideous distortions to which moral sentiment is subject, the degree in which so many barbarous nations have hallowed fraud and revenge, and quenched benevolence and compassion, shows that it is hardly possible to affix limits to the extent to which these principles of our nature may be overlaid and disguised.

Once more; the advocate of the same one-sided philosophy is apt to say, from the unquestionable existence of a religious tendency and a religious faculty in man, that all external revelation is either impossible or superfluous; that each man is an oracle to himself, and in possession of all essential religious

truth. What sort of an oracle nature is, if left to itself alone, let the religions which man in all ages has devised and practised, the inveterate superstitions, fanaticism, and cruelty which have darkened the earth, declare!

On the other hand, the advocate of the opposite exaggeration, that is, in favour of man's being principally, if not wholly, the creature of sensible experience, inclines to the contrary and equally pernicious extremes; suspects in relation to morals, that man is just capable of being *any thing* that education and arbitrary laws may make him, and that these alone constitute actions right or wrong; in relation to religion, that man is, in like manner, equally susceptible of falsehood and truth, and that the systems he may adopt, apart from their influence on happiness, are about equally worthy of a wise man's attention,—that is, not worthy of it at all. And thus, as on the former hypothesis, all religions, from Buddhism to Christianity, are too apt to be regarded as equally sacred, if not equally beneficial, in virtue of their being the product of the religious faculties of man; so, on the latter hypothesis, though men's religions are, it is granted, enormously different, they are all to be regarded as equally false (though not equally expedient), as the mere fabrication of arbitrary associations! Similar errors (it might easily be shown), though not equally pernicious, are apt to flow from similar exaggerations in respect to the phenomena of taste;—some folks, on the one hand, exaggerating man's original susceptibility to the beautiful, and ignoring the fact, that it is only as it is justly cultivated, that it will be ever worth a farthing; and others affirming that the beautiful is wholly factitious, and that literally and absolutely *de gustibus non disputandum.*

Only by acknowledging then, the co-ordinate importance of these two phases of our nature, and viewing even with suspicion any such analysis as would result in the disparagement of either, only by sedulously guarding ourselves from extremes on the one side or the other, can philosophy preserve itself from errors far more formidable than any of a merely speculative nature. Just as it is true, that sensation and experience are an essential and inseparable condition, as we are at present constituted, of *all* our latent mental activity, without which the mind itself would practically be dormant, nay, practically be nothing; so it is equally true, that for the *just* extrication and development of all the more potent and diffusive principles of humanity, (as those which respect religion and morals,) an external culture is indispensable, unspeakably more careful and prolonged than

is necessary for eliciting the fundamental notions of magnitude and number.*

The phenomena of sensation disengage some of our elementary cognitions with unfailing uniformity, — the ideas which respect magnitude and number, for example, being uniform in the race; and we may be certain they will be so as long as our eyes and ears have such a marvellous similarity and precision in their operations. But the moment we come to activities of a higher order, and which yet, as most philosophers and most men who are not philosophers (perhaps quite as much to the purpose) agree to be as really characteristic of humanity as any 'sensations' whatever, — we mean the intuitions of moral and religious truth, — we see that as the variations in the external conditions of development are much wider, so they are connected with an analogous want of uniformity and precision in the extrication of the intuitions themselves. Whatever the sublime possibilities for our nature, they are fulfilled only in compliance with the proper external conditions; in proportion as we remember that if man is half what he is by the internal laws of his being, he is also half what he is by experience and education. If all this were duly felt, we cannot help suspecting that men would not renew age after age this controversy, any more than they would obstinately dispute whether the action of the external light or the structure of a reflecting surface has more to do with the particular colour of an object, since without both the one and the other we should have no colour at all.

Having thus stated our views of the fundamental principles of Locke's philosophy, and our convictions that he was never rightfully claimed by the sensational school, we must proceed to justify our assertion, that he has not met with justice at M. Cousin's hands. We must maintain that M. Cousin not only does not, as he ought to do, fairly exercise his 'eclectic' faculty, (which, we must frankly say, has often been more strenuously exerted with far less prospect of success,) in endeavouring to collate apparent ambiguities and inconsistencies, and thus show Locke not to be contradictory where he seems so, but that he often creates contradictions where Locke has left none. We cannot, of course, follow him through the analysis of all the fundamental ideas of Locke's second book, but shall confine ourselves to those we before mentioned.

---

* 'Indeed it requires much caution to form right opinions, and, as 'Dr. Moore observes, "If ideas were innate, *it would save much trouble* "*to many worthy persons.*"' (*Sharp's Letters and Essays,* p. 145.)

And, first, with regard to the idea of *space*, M. Cousin says that Locke must, on his theory derive it from sensation or reflection; it cannot come from the latter, it therefore must be got from the former. He then represents Locke as so deriving it in his chapter on 'Solidity.' That Locke does so derive historically the idea of space is admitted; but then, says M. Cousin, 'the idea of space, *in the system of Locke*, should be 'reduced and *is* reduced to that of body.' Now that Locke does not confound the two ideas is evident even from that chapter; but in his subsequent long chapter expressly on 'Space,' he asserts, half a score of times over, the perfect distinction between them.

Two or three examples will be sufficient. He says, 'That 'men have ideas of space without a body their very disputes 'about a vacuum plainly demonstrate, as is showed in another 'place.* . . . . Of pure space, then, and solidity there are 'several (amongst which I confess myself one) who persuade 'themselves they have clear and distinct ideas, and that they 'can think on space without any thing in it that resists or is 'protruded by body.† . . . . There are some that would per-'suade us that body and extension are the same thing.' . . . . He then proceeds expressly to show the contrary; because, 'First, extension includes no solidity, nor resistance to the 'motion of body, as body does. . . . . Secondly, the parts of 'pure space are inseparable the one from the other, so that the 'continuity cannot be separated, neither really nor mentally. '. . . . Thirdly, the parts of pure space are immoveable, which 'follows from their inseparability. . . . . Thus the determined 'idea of simple space distinguishes it plainly and sufficiently 'from body.'‡ To these might be added many more passages.

Nothing, then, can surely be more monstrous than M. Cousin's representation that Locke, after thus frequently and clearly distinguishing, ends by confounding, the ideas of space and body, involves himself in inextricable confusion, and asserts the identity of the one with the other:—'This,' says he, 'is what Locke has 'done in the systematic parts of his work, though, contradicting 'himself more than once, for he often speaks of space as wholly 'distinct from solidity. But when his system comes in, when 'the necessity of drawing the idea of space from sensation comes 'in, then he affirms that the idea of space is acquired by sight 'and touch; and as touch, aided by sight, gives us only body 'and not space, Locke for this reason alone reduces space to

---

* Book ii. ch. 4. § 3.

† Ibid. § 5.

‡ Book ii. ch. 13.

'body; he does this expressly when he says, that "to ask '"whether this universe exists somewhere, is to ask whether '"the universe exists." The confusion of the existence of space 'and the existence of the universe is the confusion of the idea 'of space and the idea of body; and this confusion was neces-'sary that the system might be, at least in appearance, 'rigorous.'*

It is much the same with M. Cousin's misconception of Locke's idea of duration. Having given him deserved praise for deducing the idea of duration from the succession of our thoughts (making it therefore an idea of reflection *ab origine*), he declares that Locke has confounded the idea of time with that of succession; so that, according to Locke, the *existence* of time depends on man's perception of it, though he has expressly affirmed the contrary.

'Locke saw,' says M. Cousin, 'that the idea of time is given 'us in succession, and that for us the first succession is neces-'sarily the succession of our ideas. Thus far Locke merits 'only praise, for he gives the succession of our ideas as the only 'condition of the acquisition of the idea of time; but the condi-'tion of a thing is easily taken for the thing itself; and Locke, 'after having taken the idea of body, the mere condition of the 'idea of space for the idea of space, takes also the condition of 'the idea of time for the idea itself; he confounds succession 'with time; he no longer simply says, "the succession of our '"ideas is the condition of the conception of time;" but he 'says, "time is nothing else than the succession of our ideas."'

Whether here, as with regard to space, Locke gives a satisfactory account of the genesis of the notion or not, most assuredly he ought not to have been charged with having reduced his idea of 'duration' back again to mere 'succession.' But let us hear Locke himself: 'A man having from reflection

* Lecture xviii. On M. Cousin's inversion of Locke's meaning on this subject we spare ourselves the trouble of saying anything further; for it is amply exposed in a brief but acute article in this journal. (Vol. lix. p. 359.) The writer shows not only that Locke every where maintains the contrary of what M. Cousin affirms, but that *the only passage* (that above cited by M. Cousin) which could by possibility give any plausibility to the charge can only be made to do so by insulating it from its context. M. Cousin has utterly misapprehended the passage by not attending to the two meanings of the word 'place' in English, 'which,' says Locke, 'properly means the position of a 'body in space relatively to others, in which sense the *universe* has 'no place; sometimes, but more improperly, the space any body 'occupies,' in which sense the universe *has* a place.

'on the succession and number of his own thoughts got the 'notion or idea of duration, he can apply that notion to things 'which exist while he does not think, as he that has got the 'idea of extension from bodies by his sight or touch can apply 'it to distances where no body is seen or felt.' (Book II. ch. xiv. § 5.) He elsewhere expresses it, 'The mind, having got the 'idea of any portion of time, as a day or a year, it can repeat 'it as often as it will, and so enlarge its ideas of duration 'beyond the being or motion of the sun, and have as clear an 'idea of the 763 years of the Julian period before the beginning 'of the world as of any 763 years since.' Yet according to M. Cousin, 'Locke's theory conducts to the result that time is 'nothing else than what the succession of our ideas makes it;' that 'if a man sleep, or be seized with lethargy, or the clock stop,' time vanishes to him. There is not the shadow of a reason for misrepresenting Locke on this point.

We must also be permitted to say, that in arguing to Locke's imputed 'sensational' tendencies from the supposed deficiencies of his representation of our notions of the infinite, or of its two forms — immensity and eternity — M. Cousin has viewed the matter far too much from a 'transcendental' position. Locke affirms, that we get our idea of infinity, and its forms—at best an inadequate one—from the power of the mind to augment and multiply indefinitely and *ad libitum* the notion of finite magnitudes or duration. This may or may not be metaphysically correct, and therefore the subject of discussion. But whether he be right or M. Cousin, who supposes that we have a positive idea of infinity, it is plain that an idealist may consistently maintain Locke's view. It is evident that, though Locke thought that the mind in the course of its development would necessarily come to a dim apprehension of the infinite, yet that a positive idea of it we have not. The whole chapter on 'Infinity,' but especially the two last sections, as well as many other portions of his Essay, show that he deemed 'a philosophy of the un-'conditioned' impossible to man.* But if all are to be denominated 'sensationalists,' or suspected of a tendency thereto, who

* 'But yet after all this, there being men who persuade themselves that they have clear positive comprehensive ideas of infinity, it is fit they enjoy their privilege; and I should be very glad to be better informed by their communication. For I have been hitherto apt to think that the great and inextricable difficulties which perpetually involve all discourses concerning infinity, whether of space, duration, or divisibility, have been the certain marks of a defect in our ideas of infinity, and the disproportion the nature thereof has to the comprehension of our narrow capacities.' (Book ii. ch. 17. § 21.)

deny that the idea of the infinite is any thing more than negative, who deny the capacity of man for a philosophy of the 'unconditioned,' some of the most strenuous opponents of the sensationalists must be henceforth reckoned in their ranks — Sir W. Hamilton among the number. M. Cousin says, 'Empiri-'cism, which is exclusively grounded on internal or external 'experience, is quite naturally led to the denial of the infinite; 'whilst idealism, which is exclusively grounded on the reason, '*very easily* forms a conception of the infinite, but finds *great* '*difficulty in admitting the finite*, which is not its proper 'object.'

'Pleasant dilemmas of philosophy!' the world may well say. One man tells us that he has great difficulty in forming a notion of the finite; another, that he can properly form no notion of the infinite! Such diversities might almost tempt one to adopt Pascal's sarcastic view of the true province of philosophy, 'Se 'moquer de la philosophie, c'est vraiment philosopher.'

Similar observations apply to M. Cousin's strictures on Locke's notion of substance, which was so much canvassed, even in Locke's time. We have seen him, in his reply to Stillingfleet, conceding that, from the very constitution of the mind, we cannot *but* suppose that there is some unknown 'somewhat,' in which the qualities of objects and properties of thought, which we perceive or of which we are conscious, inhere; his admission of this is as distinct as M. Cousin's or the Bishop of Worcester's can be; and he as distinctly attributes it to an inability of our minds to think otherwise; to a necessary condition — a fundamental law of thought. Yet M. Cousin says that 'Locke systematically denies the idea of substance,' though, he adds, 'doubtless, many passages might be cited in 'which he implicitly admits it. . . . Locke every where 'repels the idea of substance; and, when he professedly explains 'himself in regard to it, he resolves it into a collection of simple 'ideas of sensation and reflection. . . . Admitting only 'ideas explicable by sensation or reflection, and being able to 'explain the idea of substance by neither, it was necessary for 'him to deny it, to reduce it to qualities which are easily 'attained by sensation or reflection. Hence the systematic 'confusion of qualities and substances, of phenomena and being; 'that is, the destruction of being, and consequently of beings.'

We must be permitted to say that Locke says nothing to justify any such representations; and his answers to the charges of Stillingfleet fully show it. He admits that we have and cannot *but* have an idea of substance, of some entity which underlies and supports — (it is impossible to avoid using figurative lan-

guage)—the qualities which we cannot conceive to exist separately; he admits that the idea of a *somewhat* is clear and definite, though it is not the idea of a clear or definite 'somewhat;' just as, if we saw something moving in a sack, we might be sure that there was a living and moving 'somewhat' there, though we could not tell what; or, to use his own illustration, we might be sure that a house rested on a foundation, though whether it were rock, brick, or piles, we might be ignorant.

It has often been asked, and was in Locke's time, what precise sense he attached to the word 'Ideas,' which so perpetually occurs throughout his Essay. He says, 'It being that term 'which I think best serves to stand for whatsoever is the object 'of the understanding when a man thinks, I have used it to 'express whatsoever is meant by phantasm, notion, species, or 'whatever it is which the mind can be employed about in 'thinking.'

And is not this enough? it may be said. Why, yes; rather too much. It is one of the cases in which, perhaps, the half would have been more than the whole. It simply says, that whatsoever 'ideas' are, Locke means to treat of them as things which men are conscious they have, and variously denominate. But this gives no answer to the above question. It having been a very widely prevalent—at one time, almost universal—notion that ideas were something distinct both from external objects and the percipient mind (philosophers could not agree what), did Locke, or did he not, concur in this opinion? The answer is, that very many of his expressions would favour the former notion; many, on the other hand, would imply the contrary; as would also his enumeration of the popular terms which, he says, he regards as synonymous with 'Ideas.' Our own view is, that Locke, if pressed to give a precise answer, would have said that he did not know what answer to give. It is a question, apparently, which (however erroneously) he deemed us incapable of deciding; and therefore, in conformity with the general practical spirit of his philosophy already adverted to, evades it as a question which he felt little inclination to discuss. The subject has assumed interest, as is well known, from the controversy respecting Reid's claims to having confuted the ancient ideal theory of perception. He classes Locke, as well as the generality of philosophers of his time, as among those who used the word 'idea' in the sense of a *tertium quid* between the percipient mind and the external object. Brown ridiculed this notion, alleged that in Locke's time the word had generally been used metaphorically, and affirmed that Reid's achievement was much like that of seriously refuting the Grecian mythology in

hope of converting some unfortunate poetaster who still talks 'in his rhymings to his mistress, of Cupid and the Graces.'

We suppose that all who have read Sir W. Hamilton's profound researches on the history of the theories of perception will admit that Reid had much more ground for his assertions as to the meaning generally attached to the term since Descartes' time, than Brown imagined. Whether Reid rightly represents Locke's use of the term, however, we have always had, and still have, our doubts. There is one passage in Locke's notice of Malebranche's theory which, in Sir W. Hamilton's judgment, favours the notion that Locke shared in the current notions; were it not for this, the accomplished critic, it appears, would share in our doubts.* He says, 'In employing thus indifferently 'the language of every hypothesis, may we not suspect he was 'anxious to be made responsible for none?'

This, in our judgment, truly represents the case. But it is hard to reconcile such expressions as the following:—

He says, in the chapter on 'Retention':—'But our ideas 'being nothing but actual perceptions in the mind, which *cease* '*to be any thing*, when there is no perception of them, this lay-'ing up of our ideas in the repository of the memory, signifies 'no more but this,—that the mind has a power in many cases 'to revive perceptions which it has once had. . . . And in 'this sense it is that our ideas are said to be *in our memories*, '*when, indeed, they are actually nowhere*, but only there is an 'ability in the mind, when it will, to revive them again.' In the chapter on 'Duration' he speaks thus:—'That a man 'may have one selfsame single idea a long time alone in his 'mind, without any variation at all, I think, in matter of fact, 'is not possible; for which (not *knowing how the ideas of our* '*minds are framed, of what materials they are made*, whence they 'have their light, and how they come to make their appearances) 'I can give no other reason but experience.' These passages no doubt may be *made* to harmonise with either hypothesis in question; but the former would *more naturally* suggest the one, and the latter the other.

But whatever doubts may attach to Locke's use of the word 'idea,' there can be none that M. Cousin, in his 21st and 22nd lectures ('Theory of Representative Ideas') has done him

* We have read, and re-read the passage in question, and cannot make up our minds that it implies anything more than Locke's dissatisfaction with the theory proposed *as well as* of every other. The reader may consult the passage in Sir W. Hamilton's 'Essays,' p. 77., or Locke's works, 'Examination,' &c. § 39., vol. viii. p. 234. London.

grievous injustice. M. Cousin assumes that what Locke says of the necessity, in order to constitute 'knowledge,' that ideas be 'conformed' to their objects, is to be taken in strict literality, and not at all metaphorically. He argues at great length on this hypothesis, and then assumes that Locke *must* mean that, in every case, this 'conformity' of ideas to their objects must imply resemblance; resemblance, an image; an image, a material image, since there can be no immaterial image. Yet he himself proceeds to show at length that Locke distinctly declares that the ideas of what he calls the secondary qualities of matter, are *not* conformed to any objects in this literal sense—a point on which he also dwells in his controversy with Stillingfleet. M. Cousin fully admits all this; but then sets it down as usual to Locke's gross inconsistencies and contradictions; that is, having resolved that Locke shall be interpreted literally when his express declarations show that he intended to be understood metaphorically, the critic easily proves that Locke is full of paralogisms! Surely the supposition of metaphor, since there are cases in which the literal is avowedly abandoned, would have been the more charitable, or, rather, the more just interpretation, except where Locke *expressly* affirms the contrary.

The misconception of Locke in these two lectures is carried to the extent of inferring that, in consistency with principles here arbitrarily imputed to him, Locke's philosophy left him in scepticism as to the existence of any finite spiritual existences, even including *human* spirits! Only revelation, it seems, rescues him from the dilemma. The passage is so remarkable, that it is worth inserting: —

'But when Locke comes to the spiritual world, to which the sensualistic school adhere less closely, the arguments which naturally arise from his own theory, strike him more forcibly, and see what he declares (book i. ch. xi. § 12.): "We can no more know that there are "finite spirits really existing by the idea we have of such beings in our "minds, than by the ideas any one has of fairies, or centaurs, he can "come to know that things answering those ideas do really exist." This seems to me to be absolute scepticism; and you, perhaps, think that the last conclusion of Locke will be that there is no knowledge of finite spirits, consequently none of our soul, consequently again, none of any of the faculties of our soul; for the objection is as valid against the phenomena of the soul as against its substance. In this he should have terminated; but he did not venture to do it, because there is no philosopher at the same time more wise and more inconsistent than Locke. What does he then do?

'In the danger in which his philosophy involves him, he abandons his philosophy, and all philosophy, and he appeals to Christianity, to revelation, to faith.'*

* Lecture xxi.

Cousin here mercifully acknowledges, as usual, that Locke is saved from this abyss of scepticism by that happy 'incon-'sistency' and 'contradiction' which protects him in so many other terrible emergencies! But it requires only a simple inspection of the whole chapter in the Fourth Book, and its context, to see that Locke is not speaking or thinking of finite *human* spirits at all. As his whole work shows that he never doubted of a material world, or of other human bodies besides his own, so he never doubted of other human spirits like his own; he never shared in Descartes' experimental scepticism in such matters.

It is clear that in the passage in question he is referring to finite spirits *not human*, and invisible and inaccessible to us: we have a knowledge of God, he says, independently of revelation; but of any such spirits we have none *except* from that source; and we presume that, as to this, few, except those ancient conjurers who could 'smell spirits,' will have any doubt.*

Having thus defended Locke from what we deem M. Cousin's misconceptions—though we have by no means exhausted the catalogue—candour requires us equally to admit that, on many points on which he has insisted in his exceedingly acute prelections, we should at once agree with him. We have said, indeed, that we admire most those parts of the lectures on Locke, in which he forgets Locke altogether. Still, in our judgment, many of his strictures are just, and admirably expressed.

We must agree with M. Cousin, for example, that it would

* We are sorry to see that M. Cousin's criticism is virtually repeated by Mr. Morell in his 'History of Modern Philosophy,' and the same passage of Locke is referred to for its justification. It can surely only have been from not examining the context. We may also remark that this author, in endeavouring to ascertain the sense which Locke attaches to the word 'ideas,' leaves one point doubtful which Locke has decided. 'That Locke,' says he, 'believed all the 'apparatus of sensible species, intelligible species, and phantoms, as 'given by Aristotle, we think very improbable.' It is quite certain he did *not*, for he expressly disclaims it in his brief examination of Father Malebranche's theory. 'Though the peripatetic doctrine of 'the species does not at all satisfy me, yet I think it were not hard 'to show, that it is as easy to account for the difficulties Malebranche 'charges on it, as for those his own hypothesis is laden with. But 'it being not my business to defend what I do not understand, nor to 'prefer the learned gibberish of the schools to what is yet unin-'telligible to me in P. M., I shall only take notice of so much of his 'objections, as concerns what I guess to be the truth.'

have been better, in point of method, if Locke, instead of plunging at once into the obscure question of the origin and genesis of human knowledge, had, like most metaphysicians since his time, first taken an exact survey of the phenomena and products of the mind after its development,—of its contents as they actually exist in its mature condition. Further, we must concede that the sharp line which Locke often seems to draw between the passive state of mere sensation and the development of the ideas of reflection — as if there were an appreciable interval—is not philosophically correct; that it would be more exact to say that, contemporaneously with sensation, the mind begins, in its turn, and according to its fundamental laws, to react on the materials of thought. It is really as impossible to imagine that the mind begins distinctly to feel without having the germs of thought stirred, as it would be to imagine that the dawning light falls on objects before they begin to reflect that light in different colours according to the properties of their material structure. If it be said that it is difficult to suppose any reflex knowledge of its own operations in the mind of infancy, we certainly agree to it; and it is equally impossible to suppose any distinct knowledge of its own sensations. To a distinct reflex consciousness of the former, many never come, and very imperfectly to the latter; but the mind may be essentially active notwithstanding. There will always, indeed, be a difficulty in imagining the commencement of any process which is marked by the law of continuity, and begins with movement infinitely *little*, whether the paradox present itself in the motion of matter or the motion of mind, in the outward or the intellectual world. Locke, however, does not avoid the difficulty; he himself says, 'If it be demanded, when *man begins* 'to have any ideas, I think the true answer is, when he first has '*any sensation*. . . . . He conceives, that ideas in the 'understanding are coeval with *sensation*.' They come pretty early then.

We must also agree with M. Cousin, that the earliest are far from being always the simplest phenomena of mind, as Locke's historic analysis would often lead a reader to suppose: that on the contrary, they are often of the most complex character—deeply convoluted, and requiring the subtlest analysis to disentangle them.

Neither can it, we think, be denied that Locke too habitually expresses himself so as to induce a suspicion that he lays a relatively disproportionate stress on the sensational elements of human knowledge. Now in the exposition of any theory which embraces complex phenomena, it is of immense importance that

each of them be insisted on with a due regard to its relative significance. When this is neglected, a very false impression may be produced, even though the views presented may be substantially correct; nay, it may even give to representations, in themselves true, all the effect of falsehood. Though error be not taught, the exaggeration of some one truth or the distortion of another, may produce on the reader much the same result as error; just as in morals or theology, it is observed, that those who too habitually treat their pupils only to one *set* of doctrines, true though they be, will often lead those pupils to hold these doctrines so completely to the exclusion of others,—in fact, in a way so subversive of important antagonistic truths, that they may produce nearly all the effects of pernicious falsehood.

A still more serious fault in Locke is what we may venture to call a *tang*, if not of materialism, of something that displays a latent tendency towards it. Some one says, 'His philosophy 'smells of the earth, earthy.' The expression is too strong, but has its excuse, if not its vindication. This tendency is not often seen, indeed, in confounding the phenomena of mind, sensational or otherwise, with the mere material organisation or material conditions with which they are connected; for few metaphysicians have been more free from this gross physiological bias than he; he in general vindicates 'to mind the things that are mind's,' with sufficient clearness and precision. An instance to the contrary, however, may be given in his ludicrously curt resolution of the phenomena of association by the aid of nervous mechanism, and the 'animal spirits;' which mysterious 'spirits,' in virtue of that smooth tramway which they have worn in the course of their frequent peregrinations up and down the nervous filaments, move with ever increasing facility. This is an account of the matter, which, if we are not to regard the whole of his language on this subject as grossly metaphorical, must be called grossly material. But, at all events, can we wonder that folks attributed to some materialistic bias his pertinacious defence of the gratuitous thesis, that for aught we know, *thought* may be among the possible endowments of *matter?*—the more provoking, inasmuch as he freely allows that all we know of our own or of any minds, implies, with the highest degree of moral certainty, that they are *immaterial.*

This gratuitous hypothesis of a possible thinking matter leaves him without an adequate answer to the question of Stillingfleet, who, in that point, at least, has the better of his antagonist; 'How shall we know that our minds or that any 'minds are immaterial?' For since it is only by the entire

difference of all the properties and phenomena which characterise matter and mind respectively that we infer them to be different substances, how shall we any longer distinguish them if one may be endowed with the properties of the other? If there may be a mind of a given number of cubic inches and of given density, how shall we be sure that our minds are not of the number? And (what is perhaps quite as important) how shall we know that every particle of matter has not thought and feeling attached to it as well as extension and impenetrability; for if there be thinking substances, say of a millionth of an inch square, and of the specific gravity, say ·0786 of hydrogen, we see no reason why there may not be also in any particle of dust some glimmering of sensation, abstraction, memory, and feeling. The utter absurdity of any such hypothesis as applied to the Supreme Intellect Locke freely acknowledges; but his reasoning is not very conclusive against an obstinate anthropomorphist, who should insist on his abstract possibilities of mental endowments in matter. All the conditions of the argument ought to have led him, especially since he acknowledged the utmost probability of our own minds not being material, to renounce an hypothesis so purely gratuitous.

Locke takes refuge in the obscurity of our idea of substance. He seems to have supposed that one and the same substance might underlie the properties of either matter or thought — our idea of it being too obscure to justify us in pronouncing as to the question of *species*. Yet as he admits that we have an obscure idea of substance, we think it *might* be admitted that we have an obscure idea of its species, rather than maintain such paradoxical opinions; not to say, that Locke does in fact admit species of substance, since he admits that God is *not* material — and that the world is. And yet (as we have already remarked) it was really modesty, though it may be deemed a very superfluous modesty, which made him defend his paradox. The spirit which made him thus irrationally cautious, we may approve; though we may lament its application. On the other hand, the adventurous Leibnitz, though in the right as regards this particular speculation, defends his opinion by an assertion equally gratuitous—unless, indeed, the exception he makes reduces it to a truism. He says, with Locke, that though we must believe many things which we cannot comprehend, yet that 'dans l'ordre 'de la nature, (les miracles mis a part) il n'est pas arbitraire à 'Dieu de donner indifféremment aux substances telles ou telles 'qualités; et il ne leur en donnera jamais que celles, qui leur 'seront naturelles, c'est à dire, qui pourront être derivé de leur 'nature comme des modifications explicables. Ainsi on peut

'juger, que la nature n'aura pas naturellement l'attraction;'* and he, therefore, classes gravitation, as a property of matter, with those occult qualities to which as a *Deus ex machinâ*, the ancient philosophers resorted when any phenomenon knocked at their door, and asked for an explanation!

As to Locke's notions of 'personal identity' we give him up to the full severity of M. Cousin's strictures, who assuredly does not spare him. We have nothing to say for our great metaphysician here. That personal identity is dependent on consciousness, so that if a man loses *that*, temporarily or permanently, he is temporarily or permanently not the same person; that he loses it when asleep, or drunk, or in a delirium, or from a bad memory; all this is so strangely paradoxical, so opposed to the most intimate convictions of mankind, that it never has been nor is likely to be received by any who are not already 'beside themselves;' and yet it necessarily follows from Locke's theory. But we need not dwell on this.

Is it to Locke's disproportionate estimate of the external influences which modify the intellect, that we must attribute a tendency, not only in his essay, but in his work on 'Education,' to ignore, or at least misestimate the peculiarities of internal structure in the *individual* mind? It would seem as if that same tendency which, as regards the generic characteristics of the human intellect, prevented a due appreciation of its internal powers of shaping and moulding the materials of knowledge,—of transforming and reacting upon them, similarly led him to under-estimate the original varieties of different minds. That old expression of the *tabula rasa* seems to have haunted him where the 'veined marble' of Leibnitz would assuredly have been a happier metaphor. From some expressions in the 'Treatise on 'Education,' one would almost imagine that he thought that the specific differences of mind were of comparatively little moment; and that nearly all that distinguishes one mind from another is attributable to education. He could scarcely have thought so, yet his language is as follows;—'I think I may say 'that of all the men we meet with, nine parts of them are what 'they are by their education. It is that which makes the great 'difference in mankind.'

Facts we think, on the contrary, make it pretty obvious, that as man, *in general*, becomes what he is as much by the fundamental laws of thought, as by exposure to the outward conditions which are indispensable to any thought at all,—so in the *varieties* of the species, the man becomes what he is, quite

* Nouveaux Essais. Avant-propos, p. 21.

as much by the individual peculiarities of his mind (for probably no two minds are more alike than any two faces), as by the culture to which he may be submitted. We have much sincere respect for the schoolmaster, and believe that he can do very much, but do not quite believe in his omnipotence, or that he can obliterate any of the differences between a genius and a blockhead. We have a suspicion that though a Milton or a Napoleon *might* have cut poor figures if born and bred peasants, yet that it does not follow that ordinary peasants need but to be duly cultivated to turn them into Miltons or Napoleons. 'Elle fait 'danser l'ours,' says Helvetius, of education; but we doubt if it can be said, 'Elle fait penser l'âne.' 'I imagine,' says Locke, 'the minds of children are as easily turned this or that way as 'water itself.' On this Hallam justly remarks, 'Those who are 'conversant with children on a large scale will, I believe, 'unanimously deny this levelling efficacy of tuition. The variety 'of characters even in children of the same family, where the 'domestic associations of infancy have run in the same trains, 'and where many physical congenialities may produce, and 'ordinarily *do* produce, a moral resemblance, is of sufficiently 'frequent occurrence to prove that in human beings there are 'intrinsic dissimilitudes, which no education can essentially 'overcome.'

But whatever excess of influence Locke may have attributed to education, he at least does not suppose it would work the miracles which both Bacon and Descartes venture to promise from their 'methods of philosophising.' It is curious that all three alike seem chargeable with this fault of overlooking the radical and enormous inequalities of different minds. It cannot well be said that knowing man better than they knew men, and modestly judging others by themselves, they thought the interval between them and their fellows less than it was; for all of them were well acquainted with the world—two of them profoundly. It is an error to which philosophers are very generally liable in favour of 'rules,' and especially when the rules are their own. Bacon says, '*Our* method of scientific discovery almost equalises 'intellects, and does not leave much to their peculiar excellence, 'since it accomplishes every thing by means of most sure rules 'and demonstrations;' and he hence compares the process of discovery to describing a circle by compasses, in which it does not much matter whether the hand be skilful or not.* Nor is Descartes less confident. 'Now, throughout this treatise we 'shall endeavour to trace with accuracy, and to smooth, the road

* Nov. Org. lib. i. Aphor. cxxii.

'which may conduct man to the discovery of truth, so that the 'most *ordinary* mind, provided it is profoundly penetrated with 'this method, shall see that truth is no more denied to it than 'to any other, and that if it is ignorant of anything, it is from 'no want either of sense or capacity.'*

Yet is it a magnanimous trait — thus to hope well for humanity! And so vast no doubt is the effect of education and training, especially in relation to the moral habits of mankind, that we can readily excuse the language of hyperbole. Its tendency, at all events, is to make men aspire high for themselves, if they will not be wanting to their own powers, and to stimulate them to do their best for those whose education is committed to them. In his 'Conduct of the Understanding,' Locke inculcates similar inspiriting maxims, but with a more frank admission of the disparity and diversity in different minds.

The chapter on 'Power' is one of the most comprehensive and powerful in the 'Essay,' but one also that has led to abundant doubts as to which side Locke takes in the great controversy to which it principally relates.

At the commencement of this chapter Locke traces the origin of the idea of power to the consciousness of the phenomena of Will, and thinks that this gives us the clearest idea of the notion of Power; which, however, he elsewhere says may be deduced from the observed changes which take place in the external world, and the succession among its phenomena; 'But 'if from the impulse bodies are supposed to make one upon 'another, any one thinks he has a clear idea of power, it serves 'as well to my purpose, sensation being one of those ways 'whereby the mind comes by its ideas: only I thought it worth 'while to consider here *by the way* whether the mind doth not 'receive its idea of active power clearer from reflection on its 'own operations, than it doth from any external sensation.'

It certainly does seem odd to say this 'by the way,' and to say nothing of this *better* account of the mode of deriving our notion of 'Cause' and Power in his chapter where he formally treats of 'cause' and other 'relations'; and M. Cousin has not failed to visit it. But then, we think, as too generally happens, he greatly exaggerates Locke's error, or rather turns it into a contradiction. He expends four or five pages in dealing with Locke's deduction of the idea of 'cause' from 'sen-'sation,' argues its insufficiency, and then says, 'But is there 'nothing more in Locke on the great question of Cause? Do 'not expect from our philosopher this perfect consistency.' He

* Règles pour la Direction de l'Esprit, p. 248.

then gives the other theory, and calls it a manifest contradiction. But the charge of contradiction is mere fancy. Properly speaking, there is no contradiction at all. Whether the idea of 'cause' and 'power' may be derived *both* from sensation and the phenomena of consciousness (as Locke supposes) may be a question; he may be right or wrong in *that;* but it is clear that a man may hold both, as Locke did, just as he may suppose that there are two roads to the same place, though he may be mistaken in the supposition. Of the impropriety of adverting to the truer and far more important solution 'by the way,' and omitting it in the 'official chapter on Cause,' as M. Cousin calls it, there can be no doubt, and it was fairly open to animadversion; it is an error of method,—there can be no dispute about that.

Some of the disputes which this chapter has occasioned, are owing to Locks's want of perfect clearness and steadiness in the use of terms,—two or three instances of which have been pointed out by Jonathan Edwards,—but the principal cause of obscurity has doubtless been the nature of the subject itself, on which from time immemorial men have so widely differed;—'The Freedom of the Will.'

Locke thinks the very phrase 'freedom of the will' an absurdity; that freedom is improperly asserted of the will. We are free, he says, when we have the power to do or not to do anything; that is, are not constrained by any external force to do or to refrain; freedom, therefore, properly relates to action, and not to the will, and to ask if a man's will be free, is as insignificant 'as to ask whether his sleep be swift, or his virtue 'square; liberty being as little applicable to the will, as swift-'ness of motion is to sleep, or squareness to virtue.'

M. Cousin objects to both parts of this theory, and maintains with so many other advocates of liberty, that freedom *can* be predicated of the will, and can be predicated of nothing else.

Of the three elements into which he resolves all that is involved in the total result,—deliberation and preference, volition, action,—he admits that the first and last of these are necessary; that deliberation will follow the law of the understanding, and preference the greater apparent good; and when decision is once arrived at, the external act, if no external force intervene, will be a necessary result; but he argues, with other advocates of liberty, that when deliberation and preference have done their business, then follows that very critical act of the will, recognised in the consciousness that we have the power to do or not to do the given action, in which the essence of liberty consists.—M. Cousin here concedes the necessary

character of that which, in the estimate of Locke, carries with it the inevitable action of the will, namely, preference founded on motive; on the greater apparent good, as some call it, or as Locke prefers calling it (though it ultimately comes to the same thing), on 'uneasiness' founded on the desire of supposed good. And here, as usual, the battle is to be fought.

M. Cousin, like Dugald Stewart, vehemently contends that Locke's view leads directly to *fatalism*, — meaning by that, that it concedes the essential point for which those contend, who have most impoliticly styled themselves, and been styled by others, the advocates of '*moral necessity*.' This we think Locke does concede; and we think it is also clearly shown in his letters to Limborch, though we are of course aware that there are those who have claimed Locke as at least neuter in the great controversy; and who affirm that he has 'uttered no certain sound.' It seems to us plain that whatever ambiguities of expression may render some parts of this chapter obscure, it must be granted that Locke *does* concede the main principles for which the so-called advocates of moral necessity contend, — that is, the certainty of volitions as dependent on motives and the greatest apparent ground of preference, relatively to the whole condition of the understanding and passions of him who wills at the time the will acts; and if this tend to fatalism, it is a fatalism with which every advocate 'of moral necessity,' — we dislike the term because it is purely analogical, derived from a resemblance in *one* point between classes of actions essentially dissimilar, — must be equally charged in spite of whatsoever disclaimers and remonstrances. This, we think, is hard measure. M. Cousin of course manages to connect Locke's supposed error on this subject with the all-pervading, all-vitiating infection of his imputed sensational tendencies. He says of his theory of liberty, as well as of his modes of proving the existence of God and the immortality of the soul, 'they have an 'intimate relation with the general spirit of his system, and 'have acquired in the sensational school an immense authority.' (Lecture xxiv.)

Yet M. Cousin well knows that Locke's doctrine of liberty is not a doctrine at all exclusively patronised by the philosophers of the sensational school, as the theory of the illustrious Leibnitz, whom M. Cousin admires so much, sufficiently proves.

He indeed advocated the doctrine in a much more rigid and decisive form than Locke has ever been supposed to do, if in fact Locke would have formally subscribed it at all. M. Cousin must also be aware that advocates of the theory, both in the sensational and opposite schools, have disavowed the imputed

fatalistic tendencies, and declared that their doctrine leaves the whole theory of human action, of virtue and vice, of motives, of the propriety of rewards and punishments, just as it was. It may be said that this disavowal of the tendencies of the system does not prove that it has not those tendencies; but to that it is replied, that the general conduct of those who have maintained the doctrine, shows that they have not been less solicitous for the promotion of virtue or the correction of vice than those who deny it; and that men like Leibnitz and Locke were not practically more 'fatalistic' than Cousin or Stewart. If it be further said, 'Yes, but it has been *in spite* of their sys-'tem: they *ought* to have been "fatalists,"' this is to beg the very question, while it admits the *facts* on which they repel the charge.

We think the only just way of looking at the theory relatively to its bearing on human conduct, is this. Whether those who advocate the doctrine of the moral certainty—or necessity, as they call it,—of all volitions, as dependent on motives, can see (as they profess to see) that it is consistent with human responsibility, or not, it is yet clear that they do not in effect deny that that responsibility exists, and that they act, and teach others to act, just as do those who hold any other theory on the subject whatsoever.

In brief, this question of the 'Freedom of the Will' seems to us another of those on which the bulk of philosophers may now be presumed in a condition, not, indeed, to construct an harmonious 'eclecticism,' (for the ultimate facts of the theories are too discordant for that), yet to exercise a wise forbearance on the points on which they differ; to refrain from charging on each other the consequences they respectively repudiate, and to agree that the points on which they are one, are, *practically*, the all-important points, and may be held equally by those who differ on the theory of them.

Many, indeed, would be disposed to go further; and, convinced that the ultimate difficulties in which the controversy originates are beyond the decision of the human faculties, and unabashed by their impotence to combine or unite the *facts* which on every theory involve insoluble difficulties, would be willing simply to admit the seemingly contrary facts to be indubitably true, as established by different species of evidence, though they cannot even imagine how they are to be exhibited in harmony. They would say, 'Yes; first, we are '*free;* we feel convinced of *that* in every voluntary action; it is 'a part of our consciousness, and nothing can dispossess us of 'it; and secondly, both reason and feeling tell us that we do

'and shall always choose, with inevitable certainty, that which, 'relatively to the whole man—the entire capacities and condi- 'tion of the understanding and the affections,—is the more 'attractive apparent good; for that we should voluntarily choose 'that which appears the less, is a contradiction.' If told that it is *not* the greater apparent good they often choose, but one which the judgment, if not misled, would acknowledge infinitely despicable in comparison, they would answer, that the judgment *is* often misled; that the 'uneasiness,' of which Locke speaks, so engrosses the mind and imagination that it magnifies the desired and immediate advantages, and diminishes the greater and more remote, immeasurably; that the mind looks at the enticing gratification through a solar microscope, and at the distant good through an inverted telescope. If told further that they thus act the fool, because passion blinds the understanding, they answer that that is part of the very condition under which they choose; and if further told that this, at least, is not the case when the consciousness of *duty* forbids, and yet is defied by a preference of the nearer and the meaner advantage, their answer is, that that is not because the greater apparent good is *rejected*, but because a wretched self-deception at the moment whispers to the fool that it may be postponed; that he will obtain *that* and the present good *too;* and that both together will be better than either alone! If further assured that though the man will act from the *present* view which his whole condition inevitably imposes on him, yet, that if it be not the most just or the most comprehensive view, the mind has brought itself into that condition by having in previous instances decided wrong; that it has obscured or neglected the light, strengthened and humoured passion, and rendered it clamorous and tyrannical, they reply that neither does this solve the mystery; for they have further to say that these previous decisions have been come at in a similar way, even from the first link in the chain —from the first moment in which the mind began to act at all; and that if we thus trace our volitions to their cradle, we shall find that the conditions of development, the germs of the first and determining actions of the series, which led to and virtually determined all the others, were provided *for* the mind, and in no way provided *by* it.

Whatever the fallacy which may lurk under such reasoning, we certainly should stare at the metaphysician who pretended to tell us that he saw no difficulty in it at all; or, admitting the difficulty, declared that he perfectly saw the point *at* which and the modes *in* which it all harmonised with the undeniable facts of our consciousness, which tells that we are free and respon-

sible for the use of our freedom. We, for our parts, should simply content ourselves with asserting that same consciousness of freedom on the one hand; and on the other, with denying that the admission (if it *must* be admitted) in the most rigid sense, of the absolute dependence of volition on the prevailing motives, and of those motives on the entire conditions of him who feels them, and of those conditions on the primary conditions of development first assigned him by *another* cause than himself,—is inconsistent (though we know not how it may be *shown* to be consistent) with conscious freedom and conscious responsibility; —*provided* always these two things concur,—the knowledge of duty, and entire freedom from all external constraint in the performance of our actions; that is, if there be the knowledge of duty, and the acts be physically unconstrained. Give both these, and we cannot but suppose the agent responsible; take away either, and the moral quality of the agent is gone; but not, we contend, from the mere certainty of the volition. The feeling of responsibility, of moral worth and moral turpitude, remains, however certain actions may be as involved in their causes; that is, however true may be the doctrine of '*moral necessity*,' as it has been very unfortunately denominated.

Let us, for example, suppose a being created with faculties so comprehensive and so well adjusted — the understanding and the conscience, the affections and the passions in such harmony — that he never *will* act otherwise than in accordance with the true and the right; — that is, though physically he can, it is *certain* he never will, act against the knowledge of duty. We know not how it may be with others, but we cannot divest the actions of such a being of moral quality; and that, too, in proportion to the intensity of will, by which it becomes *certain* that he never will act otherwise; or, in the figurative sense in which the unlucky words have been used, 'morally necessary' that he never will. In this sense is the paradox true, that the greater the certainty of volition, the greater the freedom; and that the highest liberty is compatible with the strictest necessity alone. In this sense, we are accustomed to say that God cannot but be holy and good: is he then the less free? If He can be free, is it impossible that a created being, similarly determined, and infallibly determined, by the dictates of truth and virtue, should be a free moral agent? — and if *he*, too, be free, because he has a knowledge of duty, and voluntarily, however inevitably, complies with it, must not *he* also be who, under similar conditions, violates it?

We feel that if this be a paradox, we yet cannot deny its truth; though we acknowledge it impossible fully to reconcile

the statement with the difficulties involved in the *certainty* of volitions, themselves involved in previous equally certain volitions, and these in others still prior, till we come to volitions formed under conditions which no man has provided for himself, but which God, his parents, his temperament, his constitution of mind, his education, his country, have provided for him! Still we feel, as already said, that if the knowledge of duty and the freedom from external constraint be at any moment given, we cannot denude ourselves of the belief of the moral quality of the actions so performed, however certain the volitions may be, or however involuntary the conditions which formed the cradle of the first of the series. Let the above conditions coexist, in any degree or at any point of a man's history, and we cannot get rid of the idea of his responsibility as a moral agent. If the original circumstances of his lot have been such as to preclude *all* knowledge of duty, then his moral character wholly ceases; and in proportion as they render that knowledge obscure, difficult to be ascertained or eliminated in after life, they *diminish* his responsibility;—a fact which, we confess it, is to us very consolatory, when we reflect on the condition in which millions have been born into the world, and who, by the mere impossibility of adequately ascertaining a knowledge of much of their duty, have the characteristics of moral beings reduced to nearly zero; as, for example, the child of a Hottentot or New Zealander. But let the knowledge of duty step in, and at any point, and then with regard to the 'ought,' which applies to the class of actions voluntarily performed in obedience to it or in defiance of it, it is impossible to rid ourselves of the consciousness of their moral quality, let the volitions be ever so certain, and let it be ever so impossible fully to explain the connexion which harmonises the ultimate facts. As certainly as we have the consciousness of freedom itself, so certainly we feel that no being of whom the above conditions can be affirmed can be other than a moral agent, and therefore responsible.

If all this be so, there is a point surely at which the *majority* of those who have, from time immemorial, agitated this desperate controversy, may agree to unite and make a sincere truce. If they cannot exactly construct an eclectic system out of their different theories, they may cease to charge each other with the imagined absurd or terrible consequences which, in the opinion of each party, flow from the theory of the other. The controversy seems to us much to resemble that respecting the inscrutable mystery of the union and interaction of body and mind; in which, as in so many other departments of speculation, we are at length driven to a simultaneous admission of two

propositions which seem as near a contradiction as possible, without our being able either to prove them so, or to deny them; to accept elements as actually *made* to coalesce by infinite wisdom into one puzzling harmony, though, in our hands, the analysis leaves them separate; just as we can reduce the diamond to its carbon, but cannot put it together again.

Thus, in relation to the union of body and mind, one metaphysician exclaims, 'If they are totally distinct *substances*, they 'cannot be united, and cannot have interaction; what you call 'matter, therefore, is an ideal phenomenon; there *is* nothing 'external to the mind; to suppose the contrary, is a sheer de-'lusion.' 'I agree with you in your premises,' exclaims a second, 'but I differ with you in your conclusion — it *is* im-'possible that there can be reciprocal action between totally 'distinct substances, and *therefore* mind is material, an atom or 'a congeries of atoms (though doubtless very minute), as much 'as anything else.' 'You are both right in your premises,' exclaims a follower of Leibnitz, or rather, we must say, Leibnitz himself, for in this point he has no follower; 'but you are 'wrong in your conclusion. The mind *is* immaterial, and there '*is* an external world, but there is no action of the one upon 'the other; there is simply exact synchronism and parallelism 'of movements, as between those of two exactly regulated 'chronometers.' 'We believe you are all wrong,' exclaims that greatest of all philosophers, the Common Sense of mankind; 'we believe that matter and mind are two totally distinct sub-'stances, but that, nevertheless, in some way perfectly in-'scrutable to us, and absolutely concealed from that very mind 'which is the subject of the conjuration, Infinite Intellect and 'Infinite Power have solved the mystery of their interaction; 'that to pure immaterial spirit the actual existence of a material 'world is immediately revealed in consciousness. We see the 'parts of the puzzle, but how it is put together we know no 'more — than a philosopher.' And this simple confession of facts, that of ignorance amongst them — when, as here, it is absolutely necessary, — is, in our judgment, the truest and the best philosophy, and devout and religious philosophy into the bargain.

We think the matter is much the same in the analogous controversy of the freedom of the will. There is a point at which the great bulk of those who have taken opposite sides may unite in the admission of facts, and exercise 'that charity' towards each other's hypothesis 'which thinketh no evil,' though they cannot unite into one whole the phenomena they respectively

admit. Between some of the parties, as in the other case, the repugnance is utterly irreconcilable.

'I think,' says one, 'that volitions are effects, which, like 'other effects, are involved in their causes; that the causes of 'volition are motives; that as are the motives, the first and earliest of which are in every sense provided for us, such will be 'the volitions; whether you choose to call them "moral" causes 'and effects, or "physical" causes and effects, in *my* judgment, 'makes no difference; moral necessity is the same as physical 'necessity; and, therefore, man has no freedom of will — no '"moral liberty." Here the great bulk of mankind (we think quite wisely) allow the man the full benefit or convenience of his own hypothesis, and deny that *he* at least has any power to *deliberate* with them on the matter: that he should think as he does is, it seems, a matter of necessity; that they should think as they do is also a matter of necessity; and that, therefore, much cannot come out of a controversy with him. A second (though it must be confessed that he is getting a very rare phenomenon, if indeed this species of philosopher be not absolutely extinct) says, 'The will, to be free, must be 'superior to *all* motive; the arms of the lever must be in 'exact equipoise; and then, by its own sovereign act,—per-'formed in the "liberty of indifference" — the will must 'say what it will choose.' 'The ass would starve between 'the two bundles of hay,' exclaim the bulk of mankind. 'There must be some motive for performing even the most 'trivial action — for choosing any one thing rather than an-'other; but even if it were possible to act thus without motive 'in any such trivial cases, (for example, "whether or not 'we should scratch our head in deep thought," as Locke 'says,) still, action, in all the *most* important cases of life, 'and those emphatically moral, would be impossible, because 'there the liberty of indifference cannot exist; motives, and 'those of the most powerful character, are in active operation.' It is further urged, that if they were possible, the actions so performed would be devoid of all moral value, since actions take their complexion from the quality of the motives which prompt their performance; and the only consequence of this sort of liberty would be the liberty of acting like a consummate fool, utterly without reason and in obedience to chance. After listening to such an hypothesis, the great bulk of mankind dismiss this philosopher too, with the quiet remark, 'that his '*inclination* for this hypothesis having been the result of pure 'chance, and not *reason*, it can have no weight with them; and

'that they do not wish a liberty to do anything that is unreasonable.'*

A third says, 'I feel that I am free—that I have the power 'to do or not to do this and that. I acknowledge the influence 'of motives; that to act contrary to the greatest apparent good 'would *seem* impossible; and that, therefore, if the will acts 'contrary to it, it *does* perform a seeming impossibility; I cannot explain all the mysteries of this fact, and I cannot admit 'the certainty of volition as dependent on motive: it is contingent—absolutely contingent—but I feel that I am free.'

'I agree with you in that last fact of consciousness,' says a fourth; 'but I fancy I can see *one* step further in the mystery, 'though itself is accompanied with a new difficulty. I think that 'volition as dependent on motive is inevitably certain, and not 'contingent; but I do not admit that this certainty of volition, 'which many call "necessity," is so called except from a resemblance in the one fact of certainty; the causes and effects are 'entirely different; so much so that, *admitting* the certainty of 'the volitions on preponderant motive, so far from feeling as 'I should do were the causes and effects physical, I feel that, 'provided there be knowledge of duty and freedom from external constraint, then still the agent is free, and even in proportion to the certainty of his acts. I acknowledge I cannot 'see distinctly how this should be; how man is most free, when 'his actions most seem to resemble machinery; how he is most 'virtuous, when he feels the motives to it to be *irresistible;* and 'how therefore God is most perfectly free in his goodness, 'because to be anything else to him is morally impossible!'

Now the third and the fourth of these parties, though they have, like the ordinary advocates for the union of body and mind, their insurmountable difficulties, essentially agree in the great facts of man's moral freedom, and all the consequences which result from it; in his being capable of praise and blame, of punishment and reward; the hypothesis of neither does, in fact, practically disturb the conditions of human action; and

* Locke says, 'But to give a right view of this mistaken part of 'liberty, let me ask, Would any one be a changeling because he is 'less determined by wise considerations than a wise man? Is it 'worth the name of freedom to be at liberty to play the fool, and 'draw shame and misery upon the man's self? . . . If to break 'loose from the conduct of reason be liberty, true liberty, madmen 'and fools are the only freemen; but yet, I think, nobody would 'choose to be mad for the sake of such liberty, but he that is mad 'already.' B. ii. c. 21. § 50.

therefore each party ought to abstain from the too customary invectives against the other.*

We cannot say that M. Cousin has quite exemplified this equity in dealing with Locke's system of liberty. He says, 'Locke has then suppressed liberty, by refusing it to the will, 'and by seeking it either in the thought or in the motive 'power; he destroys it, and he believes that he has destroyed 'the question itself of liberty. But the belief of the human 'race protests against the abolition of liberty, and the whole 'history of philosophy protests against the abolition of the 'question.'†

If the above charge holds of Locke, it holds much more of Leibnitz; for ourselves, we think it holds of neither, and that of both as well as of all moderate advocates of the doctrine unwisely called that of 'moral necessity,' it may be said that they leave the question of human nature, and its conditions of duty, just where it was.

Meantime, it remains true, that in this as in so many other cases, speculation carried to its furthest limits, brings us in contact with facts, the reconciliation of which is beyond us, involving perplexities which *are* paradoxes, and which *look* like contradictions. We cannot believe that they are so, because they are, in effect, somehow reconciled, though we know not how; but since we find that *seeming* contradictions are, in fact, reconciled, it ought to inspire us with extreme docility and modesty in dealing with all mysteries merely on the ground that they are such, if we have independent evidence of the truth of the separate facts which constitute them. In relation to many such mysteries, whether of Nature, of Providence, or of Revelation, we are doubtless much in the condition of a child when asked such questions, as whether it is possible that quantities can be added *ad infinitum*, and yet the augmentations, though carried on for ever, never exceed a certain very small sum? He is confident that it cannot be, and says so. Yet a very trifling acquaintance with algebra suffices to show him that he 'was a child, and therefore spake as a child, and 'understood as a child;' and so it may be with us all, when we have advanced out of our present tutelage, and look at things in the light of eternity.‡

---

* We cannot refrain from wishing that all philosophers, but especially all *theologians*, would carefully ponder the counsels of moderation, in relation to this subject, so admirably inculcated in Archbishop Whately's 'Appendix' to King's Discourse on 'Predestination.'

† Lecture xxv.

‡ That Locke regarded the problem as insoluble, and both parties

A very felicitous illustration of all this, and with a reference to the very subject which has just occupied our attention, is given in Isaac Taylor's Essay on Jonathan Edwards' 'Freedom 'of the Will.' He surmises, that if the conic sections had not been derived from the cone, and some of the most startling mathematical properties of those curves had been given, with the demand that they should all be exhibited in union in one solid, the generality of mathematicians would at once have pronounced the problem insoluble.

But we have far transcended our prescribed limits, and must conclude, though we have not said all that we intended to say even on the first two Books of the Essay. We had penned some observations on Locke's relations to 'Nominalism' and on some other subjects; we had also written, *in extenso*, on certain points discussed in his tractates on 'Civil Government,' and 'Education,' and in some of his other writings. We mention this, not that we doubt that the suppression of so much matter will be very cordially acquiesced in by the reader; nor can we say we feel any reluctance to this course ourselves, for we are as weary as he can be; but to account for the apparent omission of several topics which it might be expected that a general critique on Locke would embrace. We shall be well content, however, if the observations we have offered should in any instance give our youthful readers a more just conception of the character and value of Locke's philosophy than, we think, is always current in the present day; or stimulate them to make themselves masters of his principal writings; — assured that there are few

---

as provided with irrefutable arguments, is most powerfully stated in one of his letters to Molyneux: — 'If you will argue for or against 'liberty from consequences, I will not undertake to answer you. For 'I own freely to you the weakness of my understanding, that though 'it be unquestionable, that there is omnipotence and omniscience in 'God our maker, yet I cannot make freedom in man consistent with 'omnipotence and omniscience in God, though I am as fully per-'suaded of both as of any truths I most firmly assent to; and there-'fore I have long left off the consideration of that question, resolving 'all into this short conclusion—that, if it be possible for God to make 'a free agent, then man is free, though I see not the way of it.' Sir W. Hamilton has stated the same conviction with great eloquence in a note to Reid, p. 602. 'The champions of the opposite doctrines 'are at once resistless in assault and impotent in defence. Each is 'hewn down and appears to die under the home thrusts of his adver-'sary; but each again recovers life from the very death of his antago-'nist; and to borrow a simile, both are like the heroes in Valhalla, 'ready in a moment to amuse themselves anew in the same bloodless 'and interminable encounter.'

philosophers who will teach them more truth or, on the whole, with less error; and none — absolutely none — who will exercise a more salutary influence in the formation and discipline of their entire habits of mind.

---

Art. III. — 1. *Histoire des Réfugiés Protestants de France depuis la Revocation de l'Edit de Nantes jusqu'à nos jours.* Par M. Ch. Weiss. 2 vols. 12mo. Paris: 1853.

2. *Histoire de la Littérature Française à l'étranger depuis le Commencement du 17e Siècle.* Par M. A. Sayous. 2 vols. 8vo. Paris: 1853.

3. *Histoire Philosophique de l'Académie de Prusse depuis Leibnitz jusqu'à Schelling, particulièrement sous Frédéric le Grand.* Par M. Chr. Bartholmès. 2 vols. 8vo. Paris: 1851.

4. *History of the Protestants of France, from the Commencement of the Reformation to the present Time.* Translated from the French of G. de Félice, D.D. 2 vols. 8vo. London: 1853.

We hail the appearance of M. Weiss's book with pleasure, though it is not exactly the sort of work which we should have wished. We shall say presently, how we have been to a certain degree disappointed by the general tenor of his history; still it is but fair to mention at first the merits which give a real value to these volumes, and render them worthy of an attentive perusal.

The history of the French Protestant refugees, whom religious persecution scattered over Europe, and even on the opposite shores of the Atlantic, is one of the most interesting episodes in the annals of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Here was a subject ready for a living picture, with much unity in it and as much diversity: thousands of exiles, stamped with the same national features, cast abroad in the same storm into different regions and exposed to perpetual vicissitudes of fortune, until they are at last assimilated with the hospitable populations who have afforded them a shelter. Yet the subject, attractive as it may seem, had not been treated as a whole before the attempt of M. Weiss. Separate portions of it had, indeed, been supplied at long intervals by competent writers. Thus, as far back as 1690, we meet with an excellent description of the establishment of the French refugees in the electorate of Brandenburg, written by one of the leading men in the rising colony, Charles Ancillon, the son of David, an eminent pastor of Metz, who had

been generously welcomed by the Great Elector, and whose family, during many generations, proved a precious accession to their new country. A century later, from 1782 to 1800, two masters of the French schools at Berlin, Erman and Reclam, published nine volumes of memoirs on the same subject, and both of them died without having finished the task they had intended to perform. This work, though composed with great diffuseness, forms a very useful collection, and those who are alarmed by its bulk, may find a serviceable abridgment of it in the Appendix to Dohm's 'Denkwürdigkeiten.'

The refugees who settled in England waited longer for a history of their fortunes, but they at length found a chronicler in Mr. Southerden Burn, who having been appointed, in 1843, secretary to the commission for collecting the non-parochial registers of baptisms, marriages, and burials, undertook the work of extricating from the papers committed to his hands all the profitable matter they could yield. He has thence drawn an authentic sketch of the French, Walloon, Dutch and other foreign Protestant congregations harboured in England since the reign of Henry VIII., in the form of a *catalogue raisonné* of those curious archives, full of particulars, dates, family names and quotations; being rather well-arranged materials of a book than the book itself. Lastly, 'the descendant of a refugee' published, two years ago, a summary account of the calamities which the revocation of the Edict of Nantes inflicted on the Reformed Churches of France. The essay deserves attention, though it is written in a puritanical tone, and disguised under the strange title of 'The Witnesses in Sackcloth.' Luckily, the book is better than its title: half of it is filled with a literary and bibliographical appendix, including accurate notices of many tracts and pamphlets (some of them rare or manuscript), descriptive of subsequent events in the history of the French refugees after their dispersion.

These were the predecessors of M. Weiss, in detached portions of the subject which he has undertaken to treat as a whole. He has amply profited by the researches of Ancillon, Erman, and Reclam for Prussia, and by Burn's indications for England; he has completed the illustration which they had given of the subject with fresh inquiries of his own, and he has also extended his researches to branches they had not touched; he has followed the refugees to Holland and Switzerland, to the northern countries of Europe, and to America. His work is simply written, clearly divided, and conceived and executed in a laudable spirit of impartiality. The author evidently strives, in dealing with many delicate questions, to avoid offence to the

parties concerned. He observes, in general, a studied neutrality, to which we have no other objection than that it sometimes renders his narrative not only smooth but cold. He has, moreover, devoted the utmost attention to the statistical facts of the French exodus, and considered it with the eyes of a modern economist. Mirabeau, who was too much imbued with the ideas and passions of his own time to be able to appreciate the active elements of the preceding age, seems to have thought that the chief benefit which Prussia derived from her adopted denizens of French origin was, that she obtained through their means a better supply of fruits and vegetables, a more wholesome diet, and a consequent mitigation of the scurvy and leprosy.* M. Weiss, indeed, takes a wider view of the subject, and he ascribes to the refugees their full share in the moral and intellectual, as well as in the material development of the states where they were received. Nevertheless, even he dwells at such length upon the enumeration and the details of the trades, arts, and manufactures which owed their progress to the French settlers, that he might sometimes lead his readers into the same misapprehension as Mirabeau, and cause them to forget the men themselves for the works of their hands. But this, after all, is nothing worse than a superabundance of information upon a point which is really important, though less important than others upon which he has been too concise.

Herein consists the main defect of his work. The history of the French refugees might have proved a rich gallery of individual characters and original portraits; but these are not to be found in the book of their historian; it is a history void of men. In so saying, we no more mean to cast censure on Mr. Weiss than we should quarrel with a painter for not having reproduced upon his canvas hues and shades which his eyes were not naturally endowed with the faculty of seeing. We do not deny that M. Weiss has supplied us with an exact nomenclature of the refugees and of their different avocations, with biographical notices of the principal among them, and with a statement of their writings, or of their achievements and promotions as soldiers. But after having plodded through pages and pages of this correct and somewhat dry account, the reader will never succeed in reviving one of M. Weiss' heroes in his memory. Their figures fade away from his mind, as things which were never alive; the historian has not lived intimately enough with them to give us any striking image of their life, and with a few exceptions, he says little of their moral being. He scarcely

* De la Monarchie Prussienne, vol. i. pp. 32. 38.

informs us of the mental struggle in which so many were then engaged, and the traces of which have been so deeply impressed in all the relics of their time — the great struggle between the inward consciousness of an individual duty and the outward pressure of the civil power. He says nothing of the battles which were fought in the hearts of so many sufferers, at the fireside of so many families, when the point at issue was either to renounce all the comforts of their earthly existence or to destroy the sanctity of their most cherished belief with the shame of an enforced lie. Of the hopes and the fears, of the prejudices and illusions, of the good or bad feelings which fermented in that proscribed multitude, M. Weiss conveys to us no vivid impression. They were a medley of people tossed about in a common calamity by the persecution which had driven them abroad. Gentlemen and merchants, schoolmasters, professors and clergymen, shopkeepers and farmers, soldiers and shepherds, noble ladies and servant girls; but far removed as they were from each other by their station in the world, most of them had chosen their painful lot with the utmost firmness, and the mark of the mental effort was stamped upon their faces. We do not recognise any decided physiognomy in the lifeless exhibition which M. Weiss has made of them. Neither has he taken sufficient notice of the changes which the course of years wrought in the moral condition of the refugees once established in their respective settlements. He does not show very sensibly the increasing difference between the successive generations; between the first refugees escaping from the wreck, and their sons or grandsons more and more accustomed to the hospitable harbour.

If we wade through the ponderous chapters which Elie Benoît wrote a few years after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and read his account of the increasing breaches which had been made in it before its official abrogation, — if we follow him through his digressions and controversies, we may, perhaps, be wearied, we may find fault with his passionate judgments upon men and things,— but we feel, after all, that there are men stirring on the stage, and in spite of the confusion of interests long since extinct, we are pleased with the living spectacle of human feeling. The narration of the disturbances in the Cevennes by Antoine Court, though the work of a more impartial mind, and composed at a greater distance from the time to which it relates, conveys the same impression of human reality. It is this reality which we miss in the work of M. Weiss, and we regret its absence for the following reasons.

The subject which he had selected was a favourable oppor-

tunity for representing single actors moving in the great drama of history, and we think that such a representation would be now well-timed, especially in the author's country. History is not made by the mute operation of the collective people, to be expressed in statistical tables. It is the complex result of the acts of individuals, and there is no flesh or blood in it without the distinct appearance of individual figures. No materials for history exist until single figures have emerged from the crowd. The business of the historian, therefore, is to exhibit the influence of individual action in the determination of historical events. He ought to lay more stress upon personal motives and acts than upon the vague and blind forces of general causes. He ought to look first at the men in order to discover the secret of the events, instead of subordinating the events themselves to abstractions. It is the honour of the eminent writers who have contributed so much to the progress of historical studies in France to have now adopted this method of treating history. In such books as the 'Antonio Perez' and the 'Marie Stuart' of Mignet, the monographies lately published by Guizot, and the 'Formation du Tiers Etat' by A. Thierry, there is no danger of losing sight of the free individual agency which is the life of history. But unfortunately there has been in France another tendency, long since established, which leads the historian to a very different view of events. Without any disparagement to so considerable a work as 'l'Histoire de la Civilisation en France,' is it not true that the ability with which M. Guizot has there combined general ideas, and embodied them under national types, — that the precision with which he traces the development of certain fixed principles through successive ages, as if there was never any accidental occurrence in the ways of mankind, — that the most effective qualities of his method may have been too instrumental in diverting the minds from the spectacle of individual activity? Imitators always caricature the model which they copy. Under the influence of this system nations have been currently spoken of as materials which are amalgamated or dissolved according to elementary laws by which individuals are moved like puppets The case is not very different with Mignet's history of the French Revolution. When, in order to apologise for the crimes which characterised an era of social commotion, he insinuate throughout his rapid narrative that there was a sort of fatal concatenation in the series of occurrences, and intimate that the actors in the drama were impelled by an irresistible necessity, did he not unintentionally teach his countrymen to acquiesce passively in the course of the events, whatever may have been their moral quality? As to M. Thierry

himself, when, during the great struggle of the Restoration, he placed in so prominent a light the natural differences arising between men from variety of races, he certainly drew very dramatic pictures, intended to support the liberal interest of the moment; but did he suspect that a time would come when the influence of the race upon the condition of man would be so much exaggerated as to allow the highest authorities of his country to proclaim, and the vulgar to believe, on the credit of the official announcement, that the Celtic races have a natural love for despotic monarchy, and are unfit for the enjoyment of constitutional freedom?

It is indeed the unavoidable tendency of advancing civilisation to absorb the action of individuals in the machinery of the great social bodies to which they belong. The civilised state becomes so powerful a compound that every detached member of it, when looking at the whole, may be tempted to subside into the contemplation of his particular insignificance. This is especially the case in a country where, as in France, the national temper does not admit much of self-reliance, where the moral props necessary to the support of the conscience have been so much shattered that every one in the hard paths of life is rather prone to lean upon his neighbour than pleased to stand alone. Men placed in such circumstances are liable to lose the sense of the rights and duties attached to an independent existence. They may soon come to feel much more as inert than as active portions of the commonwealth; not having preserved any initiative within themselves, they wait constantly for an impulse from without. Now this impulse may be good or bad; the State whose movements they follow may proceed on a smooth and regular line, or roll about in a random and erratic course: there is little assistance from individuals to help it to go right, and much less resistance to prevent it from going wrong. Hence it is especially desirable that the modern historian should counteract the dangerous inclination of the times by infusing into his readers the important lesson of political and moral self-reliance; and by convincing them that each man, in his separate capacity, is a responsible agent.

History, indeed, cannot now be composed in the style of the classical models. Still, when we consider the bias which it has received in the hands of the best masters of the modern French school, we almost regret the speechifying heroes of the older historians of France, such as Mezeray, and their fictitious harangues after the model of Thucydides and Livy. The men who then appeared in the pages of the historian were not, it is true, much like the real men whom

they represented, but they were at least independent figures upon the stage. The solemnity of their oratorical displays obliged the reader to give them their due place in the world, and did not for a moment permit the confused notion of an uncontrollable influence predominating at once over a whole people. There was happily no room for such a notion in the subject which M. Weiss had chosen to treat, no occasion for any general scheme of historical dogmatism. This is our reason for wishing that he had given a more impressive appearance to his Protestant refugees. They were good specimens, had they been only studied with a more curious eye, to be put forth as a living contradiction to the abstract historical method; they could not be brought under any fatalist system. They had been stiffnecked enough in spite of their Celtic blood, and governable enough in lands of liberty, though not to be governed at pleasure in a land of slavery.

However, it is but justice to say that M. Weiss's book is not altogether liable to the objection upon which we have thus dwelt. Distinctly marked features and well delineated characters appear from time to time in his pages; but these he has borrowed, though always with scrupulous acknowledgment, from two other works. 'L'Histoire de la Littérature Française à 'l'étranger,' by M. Sayous, and 'L'Histoire Philosophique de 'l'Académie de Berlin,' by M. Bartholmès, have been useful resources to M. Weiss, and both are so closely connected with his subject, that we must now make some mention of them.

M. Sayous, the editor of the correspondence of Mallet Dupan, and the author of valuable essays upon the French writers of the Reformation, was probably led by his studies upon the sixteenth century to prosecute his researches into the literary history of the seventeenth. The French writers of the Calvinistic persuasion had begun to wander abroad in the first period of the religious discords, and kept a constant intercourse with foreign divines and scholars. This intercourse, which had never been interrupted, became still closer a century later, when the Calvinist ministers, driven by persecution from their native land, carried French literature with them to Holland, England, and Germany. They fill the principal place in the recent book of M. Sayous, which is mainly a disquisition upon the general movement of literature among the refugees. But he has not confined himself within these limits; he has taken a more extensive, though less consistent, range. He endeavours to discover the peculiarities of the French genius, either when assumed by foreigners with the French language, or when transplanted by Frenchmen out of their own country, and more or less

altered by its contact with strange manners and strange tongues. The idea is ingenious and has many attractions for a critic as refined, and as fond of literary curiosities as M. Sayous seems to be; but we fear that it might be difficult to bring it to any positive result and to support it by conclusive proofs.

The history of the Berlin Academy by M. Bartholmès is chiefly an exposition of philosophical doctrines; but the Academy itself owed its origin to the extraordinary progress which civilisation had made in the new Prussian monarchy by means of the French refugees. The Berlin academy, founded in 1700, by King Frederic I., and nearly coeval with the conversion of his electoral into a royal title, was but the complement of the literary institutions which the Great Elector, Frederic William, had established with the help of the French Protestants. The French language was even substituted for the Latin in all the academic proceedings, when Frederic II. restored the learned society and secured its existence with a larger endowment. The very existence of the academy during his reign was a continual contest between the French spirit of the seventeenth and the French spirit of the eighteenth century. The descendants of the Protestant refugees had to maintain the moral and religious traditions of their forefathers against the assaults of the wandering philosophers, whom Frederic invited out of their mother country and harboured at his court. The materialism professed by the king and his favourites, according to the French fashion of the time, was effectually checked by the profound spiritualism which the representatives of the French colony in the Berlin Academy had inherited from the preceding age. M. Bartholmès has collected and arranged the memorials of this illustrious society, and though it has not been his main object, he has nevertheless proved, in his way, a useful contributor to the history of the French refugees.

The interesting work of M. de Félice is a general history of the French Protestants in their own country, and only touches incidentally upon the Protestant Refugees abroad. He has, however, devoted two chapters of his fourth book (chap. i. and viii.) to an account of their emigration, and to biographical sketches of the principal refugee pastors.

Now, with the assistance of the several works we have here described, and with documents which we regret M. Weiss has passed over in his visit to the British Museum, we will attempt to sketch the features of the Protestant emigration, to give a short outline of the most prominent characters which made those men conspicuous in the world, though uprooted from their own soil, and scattered among the nations. First of all, let us

consider them before the days of their exile, and inquire what sort of people they were among their former countrymen.

They were a minority, and a minority which for many years had appealed for protection only to a legal title, to a written charter. This tells much about their fate to every one who knows the inveterate dislike of the French to being in a minority, unless it be a riotous one, and their natural inability to feel themselves bound by the letter of a positive law. These were the permanent causes of the harsh treatment which the Protestants endured long before they were deprived of the official guarantee of their edict.

There is a story about the revocation of the Edict of Nantes which has enjoyed all the credit which springs from frequent repetition. Even now the most popular notion certainly is, that Louis XIV., after having spent his best years in licentiousness and profligacy, married an old bigoted woman in the decline of his life, allowed himself to be governed by her arts, and thought of nothing but making amends for his past sins by persecuting his heretical subjects. Such was the first cry of Protestant opinion abroad, and such was probably the information imparted by many among the refugees. They had borne all the previous oppression without despairing, because they did not cease to put some confidence in the apparent maintenance of the edict. When it was definitively abrogated, it seemed to them as if their misery had all at once burst out, because they were precluded from their last hope of recovery. Nearly all the libels printed at that time in England or Holland agree with this general impression, and represent the King as having abdicated his royalty into the hands of his wife. On the title-page of a penny pamphlet, published in London in 1708, there is a coarse wood engraving which may be taken as a sign of the current rumour. Louis, with his voluminous wig, and his crown on his head, kneels before Madame de Maintenon, who is sitting at her ease on a high-backed state chair, and looks as if she were about to give a slap with her fan to her royal husband. The most extraordinary fabrications were invented and addressed to the credulity of the good Protestant people as an explanation of the French King's pretended conversion, and of his unexpected cruelty against their brethren in France. So, for instance, in a supposed letter of Père la Chaise to the famous Father Peters, dated 8th July, 1688, we read that the confessor of Louis had been once so lucky as to obtain the permission of exterminating all the Huguenots of the kingdom at one blow. This course he commends to his English colleague as the best to be applied to the English heretics, though

he has not himself succeeded in effecting it in France, and he has been there reduced to the slow and inadequate expedient of the dragonades. The affair is related with incredible particulars; and Louis makes the same humble figure before Père la Chaise as he had made, in the other pamphlet, before his wife. The King having committed acts of incontinence, absolution has been refused to him, till the worthy father had got from his penitent a commission under the royal hand and seal to sacrifice all the Huguenots in a body. He appoints the day of the future massacre, and meantime writes some thousands of letters to be sent into all parts of France by the same post, for urging the execution of the royal mandate. Then as the King was affected with some compassion for the Huguenots, and still hesitated, the father orders him to retire to his closet, to shut out all visitors, and to spend in prayer the whole day, on which the letters were to be sent. But Condé forces an entrance, inquires about the dejected looks of Louis, and persuades him to withdraw his commission from the hands of Père la Chaise. He runs to the post office, and arrives in time to stop the dispatch of the murderous letters; nay, he meets there the father himself, who had incautiously come to hasten the business, seizes him by the throat, draws his sword, and obliges him to surrender the commission which he had extorted. The consequence is, that Condé dies poisoned within the space of five or six days after his impious action, and the King, having craved absolution on his knees, strikes a new bargain with his confessor and the Jesuits. The heretics are to be left again at the disposal of the clergy, upon condition that they are not to be slaughtered, as had been formerly agreed, but only converted by fair means or force. Hence originated the Revocation.

We have recited at length this legendary fiction of some zealous Protestant, in order to exhibit the grotesque shape under which the false conceptions still prevalent on this point of history made their first appearance. In truth, the French Protestants had been incessantly ill-used and harassed in their domestic and public concerns since the beginning of the reign; and the most decided measures of persecution were adopted at the time when the greatest offence was given to religion and morality, by the double intimacy of the King with Madame de Montespan on the decay of her favour, and Madame de Fontanges in her bloom. The extirpation of the Reformed Churches had been so strenuously pursued years before the revocation, that the promoters of the edict of repeal believed them to be almost entirely extinct, and considered the act of the Government as rather sanctioning a state of things already in existence,

than decreeing a new one. The revocation was caused much less by secret changes in the humour of the King, than by his constant aversion to a religious dissent, which in his eyes seemed like a rebellion; the King himself was countenanced and instigated in his political antipathy by the social prejudices which the mass of the nation entertained against the Huguenots. We do not mean this as an excuse for the King; we mention the fact as illustrative of the position which the Protestants then occupied in France, and of the marked characters which divided them from their fellow-citizens. We say again, they were a minority; and we must now explain why they were an unpopular minority.

There were not at this time many remains of the sincere fury which had raged on both sides in the religious wars of the sixteenth century. Religion had become more enlightened; there was little fanatical zeal in the piety of the age. When we consider that the plan of argumentative discussion to which Bossuet challenges his opponents is contemporary with the brutal proceedings to which the royal and municipal officers resort against them as to more expeditious arguments, we must seek for another motive for such violences than blind bigotry. If the Protestants were no longer as much hated as formerly for their mere creed, they were still less to be feared for their political and military power. They were no longer a republican confederation in the midst of a monarchical state. Richelieu had put down their feudal privileges, broken open the gates of their fortified towns, razed their castles to the ground, and forced them, disarmed and powerless, into the national community. But the bold Cardinal who dared to support the Protestant European alliance against Austria, would never have assailed the liberty of the Protestant faith at home. He was even courteous to the French Protestant clergy; and when the ministers of La Rochelle went to greet him after the surrender of the town, he dexterously said to them, 'Gen-'tlemen, I am glad to receive you, if not as an ecclesiastical 'body, at any rate as men of letters whose learning and talent 'I much esteem.' Mazarin pursued the same line of conduct: the Calvinists showed themselves the most faithful subjects to the King during the *Fronde*, and stood by the royal party against Condé. Mazarin said of them, 'I have nothing to 'complain of the little flock; they browse on weeds, but they 'do not run astray.'

It was, therefore, not so much as heretics or as rebels that the Protestant minority had become an object of aversion to the nation and to the King; it was rather as a social class,

distinguished from the surrounding population by peculiar features which were nearly all repulsive to the prevailing habits and tastes of the majority. They were one million out of twenty, in whom many moral differences had almost obliterated the native similarity which should have existed between them and their countrymen. M. Sayous has, in the following passage, sagaciously pointed out some of these differences.

'They were not a State in the State, it is true, but they were a people in the people; it was a people which Calvin had founded. The modern Spartans, who obeyed the rules of that new Lycurgus, lived in a peculiar manner, according to the maxims and in the practice of a very severe discipline. They did not live, they did not feel nor think under the discipline of the Calvinist Churches, as those who had persevered in the bosom of the Roman orthodoxy, under the regimen of confession, with a belief in the efficacy of good works, and the intercession of the Saints, with the pomps of the temples, the fond adoration of the Virgin, and the gaiety of the numerous holidays. The Protestant appeared generally stern in his domestic habits, stiff and haughty in his public demeanour; his gravity was deemed rather offensive, as a mark of the undoubting confidence he placed in himself, as a sign of proud independence. Confined to the narrow circle of his home, and obliged to watch over himself, he yielded slowly and sparingly to the luxury which was increasing around him. Order and economy were thus naturally to reign over his house, and made his business thriving. The very simplicity of his worship, the small number of the feasts which he celebrated, proved for him a temporal advantage, the enjoyment of which Catholics of the lower classes grudged him greatly. The Protestants, being a more laborious and industrious class, seemed constantly to reproach the Catholics with their want of diligence and their poverty. This antipathy against the Protestants had not been at all mitigated since Richelieu had humbled their condition. On the contrary, their political depression caused the material superiority of which they carefully availed themselves, to shine in a light more provoking to the prejudiced eyes of the Catholic population. It made the Catholics more enraged at that difference of manners, habits, and feelings, which men bear so impatiently. Here is the secret of the popular impulse with which Louis XIV. complied, ill-disposed as he was, like the meanest of his subjects, towards that race of Huguenots odious to his faith, repulsive to his instinct of authority, altogether unpleasant for one who loved, like a Frenchman, the splendours of warlike glory, the majesty, the gracefulness, the gorgeous pleasures of royalty.'

A few traits more will complete the picture. There were some other characteristics which isolated the Protestants in the midst of the French nation, and made them objects of popular envy or dislike, as long as they were allowed to be citizens in their own country. First, they had more frequent inter-

course with foreigners than their Catholic countrymen. The correspondence of Duplessis Mornay is an instructive memorial of the constant intercourse between the French Protestants and their brethren abroad. Merchants travelled for their trade; ministers went to the foreign academies to study under the reformed divines who were in chief repute; foreign students mixed with the native ones in the celebrated schools of Saumur and Sedan. Noblemen paid visits to the courts of Holland, England, and Germany, and performed their journeys through strange lands with the inquisitive mind which they had inherited from the previous age, when tourists like Sir Philip Sidney were tutored by ciceroni like Hubert Languet. We read in the panegyric of the Duke of Schomberg by his chaplain, H. de Luzancy, (1690):—'Travelling was not in the time of his 'youth what the monstrous corruption and degeneracy of this 'age has made it, since it is now resolved into a smattering of 'French, and a perfect system of all manners of vices. Men 'of quality then not only learnt languages, a fine sort of ac-'complishment, but endeavoured to penetrate into the interests, 'designs, and inclinations of other countries.'

Meantime, the French Protestants at home kept a more distinct memory of their family traditions than their Catholic neighbours. As their fathers or forefathers had not embraced the reformed faith without undergoing many tribulations which had been notable passages in their life, they were the more impressed with the memorials which attested this sort of nobility. In the most obscure houses there were hereditary records which constituted a sort of aristocratic descent in favour of their possessors. The marks of that spirit and the last of those proud recollections appear in the numerous pamphlets which were issued by the refugees in the lands of their exile. One says, as his own apology, how his great grandfather, having been taught the truth by a physician of Queen Margaret, the sister of Francis I., the grandmother of Henri IV., fought as a soldier in the first battles of the religious wars; how his grandfather, a deputy of the Béarnese churches to the Synod of la Rochelle in 1620, was hanged in effigy.* Another writes a notice of his family to be presented to the syndics and counsels of Geneva, because his maternal grandfather, one of the victims of the St. Bartholomew, had been the pupil of Calvin himself in the Genevese school; and the author traces back his genealogy to 'the blaze of the first fires in which the martyrs of Jesus

* Apologie de Pierre Rival, Ministre de la Chapelle Française au Palais de St. James, 1716.

'were burnt.'* That strong attachment of the Protestants to their bloody family titles was not fitted to soothe the resentments of the Catholics. Besides, occurring sometimes in humble conditions of life, it seemed to breathe too aristocratic a spirit, and it gave a more direct offence to that levelling humour which has been a constant feature in the temper of the French middle classes, which they have often mistaken for true liberalism, but which causes the despotic sway of one man over the entire community never to be very unacceptable to them.

It must also be borne in mind that in the free management of their churches, in their consistories and synods, the Protestants had acquired or maintained those habits of discussion and self-government, the growth of which in France at large had been stifled by many causes. Besides, the tenacity with which they held to the text of the edict, could not but be particularly obnoxious to people who, thinking that the edict ought to be abrogated at once for the public safety, were irritated by (what seemed to them) a narrow-minded and lawyer-like adherence to its words. It was but one episode in the long battle which has been always so successfully fought in France against every positive law in the name of that flexible, iniquitous, and supreme law, *salus populi.* Last of all, from their former political station in the kingdom, the Protestants had retained the fame of being a great power when they were so no longer, and every one who tilted at them enjoyed the dearest pleasure of vulgar minds,—that of facing an enemy who is supposed to be strong and known to be weak.

There were in fact many vulgar motives to the general attack which was made upon the Protestants throughout France many years before the revocation. The decrees of the King's council, which were issued against them year after year since 1662, were evidently suggested by the keen vigilance of local rivalries. They were but a satisfaction given to the mean passions which are excited by the petty squabbles of provincial life, or to the covetous competitions of tradesmen and shopkeepers, engaged in the same business with heretical brethren of whom they wished to get rid. The King is not the less to be condemned by posterity for having given his sanction to those prosecutions which would not have been instituted, but for the certainty of being countenanced by his favour. Still it is also fair to acknowledge that the King, if left to himself, would never have been so anxious

* Baignoux, Minister at Poictiers, and since at the Patent in London, caused this notice, written by his father-in-law Laurent Drelincourt, in 1655, to be printed again at Leyden, in 1682.

to promote the exclusive benefit of the Catholic linendrapers, embroiderers, grocers, apothecaries, and artisans of every description, had they not been eager to advance their pecuniary interests under the pretence of their orthodoxy. The mere enumeration of the *arrêts du conseil* which debar the Protestants from trades and professions, would afford an instructive lesson as to the position in which they were placed since the beginning of the reign. In order to become acquainted with the consequences of these decrees it is not necessary to resort to the bitter commentary of Benoît. They speak out nearly as loud, when perused in a neutral book, like the *Recueil Général des anciennes Lois Françaises*, where their titles only are often mentioned. The Protestants had thus been beaten down by unremitting adversaries in all their commercial and professional interests, for twenty-five years before their definitive expulsion. They had been successively excluded by local regulations, if not always by general laws, from nearly all guilds and offices. They had been at the same time exposed to systematic indignities and calculated annoyances on every occasion of public intercourse; prohibited from appearing as a body in any official ceremony; beset with humiliation in the sanctuary of their own places of worship; compelled to pull down the high seats, which were in their churches as well as in the Catholic churches, appropriated to persons in authority; obliged to erase the royal arms and fleurs de lis from the walls and wood-carvings, as if they were not worthy of being accounted the King's subjects. The ministers had been ordered never to walk in the streets with their clerical dress, never to call themselves doctors in divinity, in order to make them feel that they were deemed neither clergymen nor divines.

The singing of psalms, in the old translation of Marot and Beze, was one of the most popular enjoyments among the French Protestants. They were forbidden by several express decrees to sing their sacred chants, either on the roads or on the rivers when travelling, or when driving the plough in the fields, or when at work in their houses, or even in their churches while the Catholic sacrament or the Catholic processions were passing by. Vainly the boldest among them answered the officers by whom they were prosecuted for such offences with the very words of the psalmist: 'I will bless the Lord at all 'times; his praise shall continually be in my mouth,'—

> 'Jamais ne cesserai
> De magnifier le Seigneur;
> En ma bouche aurai son honneur
> Tant que vivant serai.'

The favourite recreation of the Protestant people was soon checked, and the pious canticles silenced all over France. The baptisms, marriages, and burials offered other opportunities for vexing the devoted race. They were not allowed to meet more than twelve together in such domestic solemnities as a wedding or a christening. They were forbidden to carry their dead to the grave but at fixed hours — in the dim light of the dawn or the sunset. In 1664, a minister of Caen having lost his daughter, dared to have her buried with some homely pomp, a sad relief to his sorrow. He had the coffin covered with a white pall, and sprigs and wreaths of rosemary strewed over it; four young girls, with branches of rosemary in their hands, were the pall-bearers. He was fined by the judge of the place, 'for having scandalously 'attempted to make his religion look as honourable as the reli-'gion of the King;' and the parliament of Normandy enacted that rosemary, pall, and pall-bearers should be henceforth interdicted to Protestants. Shall we record the continual encroachments upon the secrecy and dignity of the domestic sanctuary? the servants turned into spies of their masters? the Catholic notaries and midwives forced upon the Protestant families? the bedroom of the sick persons open to the Catholic clergymen, nay, to the lay judiciary officers? the last hours of the dying disturbed by police inquisitions in the shape of religious proselytism? the parents robbed of their children by their Catholic relations, and lawsuits carried on in their children's name for obtaining maintenance out of the parental income to be enjoyed by their zealous guardians and converters? Still more: the children invested with the full liberty of choosing the religion they would adopt, not only at twelve and fourteen years of age as formerly, but since 1681, at seven, though even before the royal decree there had been already frequent instances of this religious kidnapping, and of mothers mad with despair at seeing their tender offspring torn from their arms, or stolen out of their cradle by neighbours or kindred?

The French Protestants were not only the victims of the bad feelings entertained against them by the majority of their countrymen, who incessantly called forth the King's power to help their animosity. They were also among the first objects upon which the government functionaries, who were as yet new in their offices, displayed a virtue of theirs which has since remained a traditional, if not always a beneficial, character of the French administration. We mean that industrious ability in bestirring themselves in their department beyond the fair limits of their plain duty; in proving something more than officers adequate to their offices. The civil administration was one of the

most active instruments with which the difficult work of establishing a national unity in France was at last completed. When Richelieu, in 1635, created a royal intendant for every province of the realm, he began one of those revolutions which produce the greater effect in proportion as they make the less noise. But it is not to be denied, that whatever might have been the real utility of these new agents appointed by the crown, they were soon attacked by the moral disease which was to become an hereditary one in their offices; they fell into an extravagant affectation of zeal. French zeal in public offices is a thing of its own, to which neither the English clerkship, nor even the stiff German bureaucracy, offers any analogy. It is a curious mixture, in which taste for dependence and love of importance, time-serving anticipation of orders from above, and rigorous exercise of authority over those below, are blended together. The intendants of Louis XIV. had not, like many of their modern successors, the means of showing themselves as 'more royalist than the king;' for loyalty in that age was like the breath of life, even in persons who had suffered most from royal oppression. But they were, each in his particular jurisdiction, the first promoters of the harsh measures which were afterwards applied on a larger scale by royal decrees. They must be held responsible for having given the first hints of the practical expedients by which the system of compulsion was carried on, when the resolution of extirpating the heresy was once enforced with the French governmental ardour. Long before the fatal year 1685, they had sent military lodgers to the Huguenots, to let them feel the temporal disadvantage of their creed; they had dispensed the new converts to the Catholic faith from paying their debts; they had bought conversions with money. The general cash office, managed by Pelisson for that holy purpose, was opened in 1676, in consequence of the good impression produced upon the mind of the King by the tidings of the cheap bargains obtained on that principle in the diocese of Grenoble. The bishop himself had been indeed the leader of the affair; bishops sometimes vied with intendants in pleasing the King. Their firm asseveration of the Gallican liberties against the pretensions of the Pope did not emancipate them from their humble subserviency to the crown, and many were evidently guided in their deportment towards the heretics, not only by their natural partiality for their own Church, but by their more worldly wish of being well spoken of at court.

Nothing can be more odious than to see this measure of religious conversion conducted with the formality of an official transaction, and almost turned into a mere matter of adminis-

tration, or even made a ladder for ambitious functionaries. When at the first outbreak of the religious wars in the sixteenth century, Blaise de Montluc went up and down the highways of Guyenne, hanging heretics on the trees, in order, as he said, to mark his passage, he did not think of courting any one, and was satisfied with quenching his rage. The clear impression which results from the perusal of the contemporary documents is, that the Protestants of the seventeenth century were not the objects of this savage and merciless hatred; but they scarcely suffered less by the more regular proceedings which were taken against them, nor did they less keenly resent a persecution of which the temporal motives were so visible.

There is a curious collection of caricatures, published in 1691, probably in London, which contains grotesque portraits of the principal persons engaged in the work of persecution. The most prominent 'heroes of the League,' as they are called, the worst-looking figures in the 'procession monacale' (they are all muffled up in monkish frocks and cowls), are neither the King, nor Madame de Maintenon, nor even Père le Chaise, but magistrates and intendants; and not only men who remained famous, like Basville and Marillac, but persons now quite forgotten, who seem to have at that time inspired the most lively execration of their deeds, inferior judges and petty officers, even a certain La Rapine, a director of the hospital at Valence, about whom Benoît has also preserved terrible accounts. Benoît himself explains somewhere, how the intendants were always more eager in their prosecutions when new in their office, because they desired to make their renown reach the court.

It is the unavoidable fault and punishment of every despotic ruler to be himself enslaved either by the machinery with which he carries on his despotism, or by the spirit of the multitude which worships him as their representative. We do not intend to apologise for the conduct of Louis XIV., by explaining how he was prompted and countenanced in his disastrous campaign against his Protestant subjects, either by the general feeling of his people, or by the intemperate zeal of his officers. We mean only to show how the generation of men, who left France at the Revocation, had been brought up under the double pressure of the vast majority who hated them, and of the many functionaries who tried to achieve promotion by their ruin. They had been well trained for their subsequent fate, well prepared for acclimating themselves among foreigners, by having been used much worse than foreigners in their own country. They endured, for a long time, the scourge of both the national and royal displeasure with patience and loyalty. 'Patient as a

'Huguenot' had become a proverbial saying in many provinces. The emigration had already begun; the life of a Protestant in France was a complication of miseries, and yet, in 'an humble 'petition presented to his Most Christian Majesty by the Mar-'shal Schomberg and the Marquis of Ruvigny,' they assured the King, in terms of sincere devotion, that the majority of them would not leave France 'for the love they bore to his 'sacred person.' They entreated His Majesty 'to make known 'to the lords of his council, presidents and attorney-generals of 'parliament, to superintendents and commissioners executing the 'law,' the whole host of their natural enemies, 'that his royal 'will and pleasure was that the edicts should be observed.' But patience and loyalty were at last exhausted; and it is no wonder that out of that flock, so long harassed by persecution, men started up in the days of retaliation, who wrote such books as the 'Plaintes des Protestants de France' of Claude, the 'Lettres 'Pastorales' and the 'Soupirs de la France Esclave' of Jurieu; men who fought such deadly battles as the French regiments of Schomberg against the French regiments of Lauzun at the Boyne, or the volunteers of Cavalier, when they so furiously bayonetted their late countrymen at Almanza.

We have dwelt upon the various circumstances which influenced the Revocation, and invested the fatal measure of the French Government with a characteristic peculiarity. As to the principle of public law which was involved in the measure itself, it was then common to France with all Europe. Toleration in religious matters, such as we understand and practise it now, is a late conquest of modern civilisation. The State, in the 17th century, was everywhere emancipated from the Church, but religion had remained the domain of the sovereign, and dissenters were, in principle, if not always in fact, treated as rebellious subjects. There was no difference in this respect between the Protestant and the Catholic policy. The history of England is a melancholy example of the total want of forbearance towards religious dissent. It was one of the fundamental axioms recognised by the Westphalian treaties of 1648, that the right of changing the religion of the people, *jus reformandi*, was attached to the possession of the territory; this principle of public law was compressed into the pregnant phrase,—*ejus religio cujus regio.* The strict application of this maxim to France had been counteracted in the time of Henri IV., Richelieu, and Mazarin, by the necessities of foreign affairs. Catholic France was at the head of all the Protestant forces on the Continent against the House of Austria, and it was this alliance which, in the middle of the 17th century, had

reduced both the Emperor and the King of Spain so much below the station which they held in Europe at the end of the 16th. Elated by the native pride of his heart and by the successes of his reign, Louis fell into the pernicious error of aspiring for himself to reach that dangerous eminence from which Spain had, by the power of France, been deposed. The parts were completely changed; and France, which had led Europe against Austria, threatening universal monarchy, went so far as to provoke the same European confederacy against herself, by forming the same ambitious scheme which she had formerly defeated. And, as Louis XIV. dreamt for a moment, like Philip II., of something approaching to universal monarchy, he was likewise induced to adopt that absolutist system of government at home which had been so detrimental to Spain. Everything must be uniform within the bounds of his empire; and he wanted to have done at once with the Huguenots, like Philip II. with the Netherlanders, and Philip III. with the Moriscoes.

The progressive ascendancy gained over the King's councils by this form of Spanish policy was much more the cause of the Revocation than any private suggestion or interference of Madame de Maintenon, who, as Voltaire truly says, cannot be charged with any other share in the measure than that of not having opposed it. Were it not too far from our present object, we could show that Madame de Maintenon had never the means of much opposing the King's wishes, and that she was far indeed from being what legendary stories represented her — the cunning spouse of an uxorious husband. Besides, if she had disliked the intended extirpation of heresy, she would have stood completely apart from her most illustrious and enlightened contemporaries, the universal applause of whom is not the least extraordinary mark of the public mind in those days.*

It is well known how hospitably the French fugitives were received in all the Protestant countries. In England particularly they were supported by the most charitable exertions of both the Court and the people, though there was a time when James II., who had at first favoured them, almost betrayed them

* St. Simon is mentioned by M. Weiss as an exception; but he was only ten years of age in 1685, and the manner in which he speaks of the Revocation, is evidently owing in part to his fear lest the glory won by Louis XIII. over the heretics be exceeded by the exploits of Louis XIV.; his constant object being to prove the inferiority of the latter to the great king who had made his father a duke. He tells us afterwards, that he resisted with all his power, in the councils of the Regent, the abolition of the edict he had so much censured in his Memoirs.

to the French King, and another, when the Parliament proved rather adverse to the refugees, for fear that they might be too convenient allies to William the Third, whose popularity did not last as long as his life.* The national jealousy had been then roused by the political opponents of the new dynasty against the powerful levies of foreigners which William had brought with him to rescue England from Popery; and Englishmen were told they ought to take care not to be enslaved by their deliverers of Dutch and French origin. 'During this 'time', says Defoe, 'there came out a vile, abhorred pamphlet, 'in very ill verses, written by one Mr. Tutchin, and called *The* '*Foreigners*, in which the author fell personally upon the 'King himself; and after having reproached His Majesty with 'crimes that his worst enemies could not think of without 'horror, he sums up all in the odious name of *foreigner*.'† Defoe wrote his *True-born Englishman* in order to answer Tutchin's poem, to vindicate the King from such attacks, and to remind England that she had not so much to boast of as to her purity of blood and integrity of race. He reminds the country of the six illegitimate dukes sprung from the Italian, French, Scotch, and Cambrian mistresses of Charles II., who,

> 'With true English pride, may contemn,
> Schomberg and Portland, new-made noblemen.'

Then he proceeds to apologise for the most numerous band of those foreign invaders, for 'the banished Protestants of France;' but he does not seem very fond himself of the people whose cause he advocates for the sake of his argument against exclusive nationality. He is glad to lay upon Charles II. the full responsibility of having invited them to England, and he speaks of their arrival in terms of very indifferent courtesy:—

> 'Hither for God's sake and their own they fled,
> Some for religion came, and some for bread.
> Two hundred thousand pairs of wooden shoes,
> Who, God be thanked, had nothing left to lose,
> To heaven's great praise did for religion fly,
> To make us starve our poor in charity.

---

* In 1699, William writes to Lord Galway, Marquis of Ruvigny, when the troops have been dismissed by a vote of Parliament,—'It 'is not possible to be touched more sensibly than I am at my not 'being able to do more for the poor refugee officers who had served 'me with so much zeal and fidelity. Assuredly, on all sides, my 'patience is put to the trial. I am going to breathe a little beyond 'sea, in order to come back as soon as possible.'—*Dalrymple*, vol. iii. p. 130.

† An Appeal to Honour and Justice, &c., 1715.

In every port they plant their fruitful train,
To get a race of true-born Englishmen,
Whose children will, when riper years they see,
Be as ill-natured and as proud as we;
Call themselves English,—foreigners despise,
Be surely like us all, and just as wise.'

We must remark, however, that this sarcastic strain does not at all agree with the ordinary style in which the refugees were spoken of at the time when Defoe composed these lines (1701). On the contrary, they had been met with the warm interest which a knowledge of their former ordeals had raised for them in the public opinion of England. The number of English relations which were printed in those days about the state of the Protestants in France or in Piedmont, is a clear proof of the general concern for the sufferings which had preceded their flight. The flight itself, the sad particulars and romantic adventures of the exodus,—the martyrdom of those who were arrested and sent to the galleys,—the whole of the tragedy is carefully described in English contemporary papers. The refugees who flocked from France to England after the Revocation, and even in large numbers from Holland after the Revolution of 1688, found there small colonies and churches of their countrymen, whom previous persecutions or an earlier impatience of the present one had already driven to the same shelter. There were thus French readers for whom the newcomers wrote in French the reports which might make them better known, or their countrymen better acquainted with the affairs over the water. Such reports, full of personal details and private information, were also translated into English, and many passed through several editions. They form a complete department in the popular literature of the time. The close connexion between the refugees and the martyrs, these true 'witnesses in sackcloth,' some of whom at last escaped from the prisons and the galleys to the land of safety and liberty, could not fail to make all sincere English Protestants look at the proscribed fugitives with feelings of respectful sympathy.

Every drop of anti-popish blood in this country must have boiled at the perusal of such a book as the *Faithful Account of the Cruelties done to the Protestants on Board the French King's Gallies**, which is far from being the only one upon the lamentable subject; for there was an accurate enumeration of all those who had been bastinadoed from the end of 1699 to October 1700, for having refused either to stand up at mass, or

* Done out of the French, 1700.

to take off their caps at the elevation of the host. Other pamphlets strongly appealed to the domestic, as well as to the religious sentiment. *The History of the Persecution by the French King in the Principality of Orange from* 1660 *to* 1687, *written by M. Pineton de Chambrun, Pastor of the Church of Orange, with a particular Account of the Author's Fall through the violence of the Persecution*; The History of the Sufferings of the blessed Martyr, Louis de Marolles; The Historical Account of the Sufferings and Death of the faithful Confessor and Martyr M. Isaac Lefebvre, who, after* 8 *Years' Imprisonment, died a Slave in the French King's Gallies,* were tales of domestic virtue no less than of Christian heroism. The severe trials through which Madame de Chambrun passed in joining her husband abroad, the kind and consolatory lines which M. de Marolles wrote to his wife from his horrible dungeon, were fitted to become affecting objects of recollection in England. They had so natural a hold upon English feelings, that the two last of the works above quoted were reprinted as late as 1788, under the care of Priestley, though his views of Christianity were so different from those of the old Protestant martyrs. But he intended, he says, by the example of unenlightened Christians, to teach those who understood Christianity as he did, to raise their minds above the world; and the last confessors of the Calvinistic faith were thus proposed as patterns to the followers of his philosophy.

A century before they had been more properly chosen by the rhymers of popular songs and ballads, as witnesses to warn the English people against the dangers with which France and Popery were said to threaten them. We have found several mentions of the refugees among the *ancient songs and ballads* of the Harleian collection. One of these is called *The Protestant Courage, or a brief Account of some hundred of valiant Seamen who daily come in to serve their Majesties against the Forces of the French King;* and the tune is the famous *Lillibolero,* with which the author, the Earl of Wharton, boasted to have sung James II. out of his Three Kingdoms:—

> 'The worthy seamen,
> Stout lads, brisk and airy,'

advance from all parts to London, and sing on their way the national grievances against the French king: the burden is, 'they will pull down the pride and power of France;' and here is one of the most expressive couplets:—

---

* London, 1689.

'Did he not drive his subjects of late
Out of their native country dear?
Those that were rich did leave their estate,
Naked and poor they came to us here.
Should that tyrant gain this kingdom,
The very same would be our hard chance.'

In the same collection there is a masterpiece of a true ballad-maker, whose excited fancy has sought for some horrors less trite than the dragonades had turned to be, and who invented *The rare Example of a virtuous Maid in Paris, who was by her own Mother procured to be put in Prison, thinking thereby to compel her to Popery, but she continued to the End, and finished her Life in the Fire.* He commences the story in the genuine ballad style:—

'It was a lady's daughter,
Of Paris properly;
Her mother her commanded
To mass that she should hie;
O pardon me, dear mother,
Her daughter dear did say,
Unto that filthy idol
I never can obey.'*

At the time when the refugees made their first appearance in this country, their principal leaders were men whose personal character was fitted to produce a serious impression. Schomberg is highly spoken of by Defoe himself in the poem we have already quoted:—

'Schomberg, the ablest soldier of his age,
With great Nassau did in our cause engage.
We counted him an army in our aid;
Where he commanded, no man was afraid.'

He had been during his long life a perfect example of the old Calvinistic rigour, and in the monarchical society of the seventeenth century he had preserved the noblest features of the great feudal chieftain. He had made a king of Portugal at the battle of Villaviciosa, and maintained a king of England at the

* The following poems, though now forgotten, likewise afford curious marks of the deep sympathy then felt with the cause of the French Protestant refugees, and exhibit them in a stern and solemn attitude: 'The French Tyrant or the Royal Slave, a Poem containing the most Remarkable Occurrences of his Reign, with his Character, Maxims, his Dream of Hell, and Mazarin's Ghost. London, 1702;' 'Sion in Distress, or the Groans of the Protestant Church for many Years past. London, 1691.'

battle of the Boyne. He had been twice stripped for his faith's sake of all that he possessed,—once in the midst of his career by the Emperor, and once more, being past seventy years old, by the King of France. 'Yet,' says his biographer, 'exposed 'as he was to the wide world, he did not so much as com- 'plain; he did not exclaim against the ingratitude of a country 'which his valour had rendered both safe and glorious.' He was a man of unaffected and deep religious feeling, which came from his lips with beautiful simplicity. Before being made a marshal of France, he had been already one time offered the baton, but upon condition that he would embrace the Catholic faith. He answered the King, that 'if upon such low motives he 'abandoned the service of the God of his fathers, he should 'deserve the scorn of all men, and in particular of His Majesty; 'and he who was not true to God could never be faithful to his 'prince.' He was overtaken at sea, when leaving France, by a storm that lasted two days and two nights. 'There was no 'calm but in the Duke's looks, who, knowing whence the blow 'came, applied himself to divert it; he caused continual prayer 'in the ship to be made to Him who commands the waves.' One of his first proclamations to the army which he led in his last campaign of Ireland is to forbid 'the horrid and detestable 'crimes of profane cursing, swearing, and taking God's holy 'name in vain,' because he 'justly fears that their majesties' 'army may be more prejudiced by these sins than advantaged 'by the conduct and courage of those guilty of them.' The discipline he meant to institute would have, perhaps, suited the camp of Gustavus Adolphus better than his regiments of refugees; but the fact is, he had something of the spirit which had inspired the Swedish king with his chivalrous advocacy of the Protestant cause.

The Marquis of Ruvigny, Earl of Galway, is scarce a less personage, notwithstanding the harsh strictures made upon him by Saint Simon and Swift, both of them partial judges. Swift calls Ruvigny 'a deceitful, hypocritical, factious knave,—a 'damnable hypocrite of no religion;' but this is a mere ebullition of spleen, such as was common with Swift against a Whig opponent. The *Account of the Earl of Galway's Conduct in Spain and Portugal*, published by his officers in 1711, to which he has evidently put his own hand, gives a very different idea of him. This pamphlet was written on the occasion of the inquiry ordered by the Parliament into the conduct of the Earl of Peterborough, while he had been associated with Ruvigny in the command of the English troops sent to Spain. One of Peterborough's apologists had suggested that the greatest fault

was in the Ministry, for having invested 'an unfortunate 'foreigner with such a station.' Ruvigny's officers answer this doubly unfair reflection upon their general. As to his being a stranger, they call to mind his family connexion with the Russells, his father's and his own standing at the head of the French Protestants, and the services he had rendered to King William. As to his being unfortunate, they say that he had indeed lost his right arm at the siege of Badajos, his right eye at the battle of Almanza, and that on these two occasions he had the ill-fortune of seeing his enterprise miscarry through the fault of others; 'but history will do him the justice to 'acquaint posterity that the famous victory of Aghrim, which 'decided the last Irish war in favour of King William, was, 'next to the Divine blessing, owing to his Lordship's personal 'bravery.'

Ruvigny was also remarkable for that calm stoicism with which the practice of the world imbues a lofty soul. He converses with a disdainful politeness about the changing judgments of men, 'having learned,' says he, 'both from his late ingenious 'friend, M. de Saint Evremond, and his own experience, that 'it is not much worth the trouble to dispute with their deci-'sions, as one is often extolled to the sky for the very thing 'which has occasioned his disgrace.' He had been always most sincerely disinterested; he had relinquished a plentiful estate in France to follow the dictates of his conscience; he had bestowed the greatest part of the income he owed to William III. in charitable uses, 'insomuch that upon the death of the 'late King he had scarce provided for himself a competency to 'live like a private gentleman in the country.' Then, indeed, he had retired 'to a small seat at Rookly, near Winchester, 'where he thought to have passed the remainder of a laborious 'life between his closet and his garden, when he was fetched in 'one of the Queen's coaches to attend Her Majesty at Windsor;' and from thence sent to Spain and Portugal. This great change did not much mend his circumstances; 'but he thought 'himself sufficiently recompensed for all his labours and warlike 'toils, and the loss both of his right eye and arm by the 'conscience of having used his utmost endeavours towards 'serving the King and the British nation,—a reward which his 'most inveterate enemies could not wrest from him.'

The stern figures which poetical fancy had lent to the French Protestants, the firm and steady character of the men who, like Ruvigny and Schomberg, had been considered for a time as their representatives in England, were, however, soon to disappear from the popular imagination. The refugees, as a body,

appear, indeed, in a very different light to the eyes of the English people, in proportion as they are removed from the days of the Revocation. Strange substitutes have taken the place of the martyrs and confessors in the view of the public, if, at least, we are to judge from the pictures which must have been the most accredited at the moment of their appearance. To be fully acquainted with that curious change we need only accompany the Spectator along the visits he pays to the old London coffee-houses, on a day when the death of Louis XIV. had been rumoured:—'I afterwards called in at Gile's, where I saw a 'board of French gentlemen sitting upon the life and death of 'their grand monarque. Those among them who had espoused 'the Whig interest very positively affirmed that he departed 'his life above a week since, and proceeded without any farther 'delay to the release of their friends in the gallies and to their 'own establishment: but, finding they could not agree among 'themselves, I proceeded on my intended progress. Upon my 'arrival at Jennyman's, I saw an alert young fellow that cocked 'his hat upon a friend of his who entered just at the same time 'with myself, and accosted him after the following manner:— '"Well, Jack, the old prig is dead at last. Sharp is the word; '"Now or never, boy! Up to the walls of Paris directly!" 'With several deep reflections of the same nature.'

These hot-headed and flippant-tongued gentlemen do not resemble the Marolles and the Lefebvres of old; they are already much nearer to the French Londoners whom, some twenty years later, Hogarth selected in his 'Noon,' as the fittest victims to his ultra-British prejudices. Every one recollects the well-known print. The scene is laid at the door of a French chapel in Hog Lane: the service is over, and the congregation emerges slowly from the place of worship, much occupied in conversation. The most forward persons in that talkative company step out as if they danced instead of walking, and seem so unsubstantial and flighty, that the kite which has been blown from an adjacent field, and hangs on the roof of the chapel, may be deemed a symbolical likeness of the people below. We may trace some signs of this unfavourable view of the French colony in London to a period much less distant from our own than the satirical extravagancies of Hogarth. An admirer of Hogarth, Charles Lamb, mentions in his 'Essays' that he had a friend of his youth, a Cambro-Briton, the last of the beaux or maccaronies, 'who was no less eloquent than 'his countryman Pennant in relation to old and new London.' He could especially afford 'many a pleasant anecdote derived 'from paternal tradition, of those grotesque figures which

'Hogarth has immortalised in his picture of "Noon," the worthy 'descendants of those heroic confessors, who, flying to this 'country from the wrath of Louis XIV., and his dragoons, 'kept alive the flame of pure religion in the sheltering obscurities 'of Hog Lane and the Seven Dials.'

The reason which brought down these satirical attacks upon the heads of the French denizens in London is plain enough, and one of no rare occurrence in any society. The less worthy among them always made the greatest noise, and London was the place where the noise echoed the loudest. It is not to be supposed that the emigration had been exclusively confined to devout and upright Protestants. There was, as in every assemblage of men, a mixture of good and bad. Most of them certainly had obeyed the earnest cry of their conscience, but others had followed, who yielded rather to the first burst of their indignation, or to the mere influence of example; others who wanted excitement more than repose; others who brought with them rather the general manners of their nation than the characteristic habits of their Church. In a sermon preached at the French chapel of the Savoy, on the death of Queen Mary, the minister, Jean Dubourdieu, spoke of that extraordinary contradiction at which he wondered in the conduct of 'the profane 'refugees,' unable to practise the religion for which they had been able to suffer.

Then adventurers came whose extravagance and malice contributed very much to give an unfavourable hue to the French colony, though the great body of it had no share in their misdeeds. From 1706 to 1708 a public scandal was raised in London by three Camisards*, who drove a sort of trade with their supposed gift of inspiration, and made public exhibitions of their prophetical spirit. The mania of prophesying had been one of the most active elements of the religious war in the Cevennes, and when the rebellion was abated, these three men who had happily escaped, and one of whom, Elias Marion, had even, like Cavalier, obtained a regular capitulation from the royal commanders, were called to England. Whether they were partners in some pecuniary speculation upon public credulity, or instruments in one of the many plots which were then formed in England and Holland against the French government, or both together, is not easy to determine. But they were at first very successful in their mysterious business.

* It was the name under which the mountaineers of the Cevennes were commonly designated during the Rebellion. Different etymologies were already suggested for that word in the time of Cavalier.

Their novelty, their seeming ecstacies, their convulsions, brought people to see them as to a play. Coaches were frequently at their doors, they were sent for to rich houses, and for the blessings which they gave, offerings were tendered to them. They were even joined by a baronet, Sir Richard Bulkeley, and by several gentlemen of the bar, among whom was John Lacy, who vied with Marion in ridiculous audacity. Their prophetical warnings were written down as soon as uttered in the middle of their fits, and printed for the general edification. Many followed the same course, and in Bristol, Birmingham, Glasgow, as well as in London, English prophets and prophetesses entered into competition with the French. A vehement controversy arose upon the matter; pamphlets were published, sermons preached against 'the enthusiastic impostors.'

Their enthusiasm had indeed assumed a more dangerous form than ordinary delusions of religious fanaticism. Their ranting led to more practical conclusions than the declamations about Babylon and Antichrist. From general harangues against Babylon, they came in a little time to declaim against crowns and churches, against the tyranny of the priesthood and all subordination. Babylon and Antichrist were always artfully introduced upon the stage, and people were at liberty to believe that they meant Rome and her pope; but, in fact, by the help of these two words taken in a new sense, the prophets said whatever they pleased against the order of society, as 'Babylon and 'Antichrist were to be found everywhere.' After having railed at the ministers of the Established Church as much as they wanted 'to set the rabble at them,' they went on against the rich with their levelling principle, and here we have the old English saying repeated again after so many centuries:—

> 'When Adam delved and Eve span,
> Where was then the gentleman?'

The prophetical warnings of Marion are full of demagogical declamations against England and her laws, and under the transparent veil of the Eastern imagery, borrowed from the sacred language of the Hebrew prophets, he constantly threatens plunder, murder, and destruction: 'My child, I have something 'to tell thee: I am going to put an end and to release all the 'galley slaves of the earth; the chains are going to fall off 'within a few days; an universal liberty is coming into my 'house; there shall be no more slaves, no more labourers at the 'oar; there shall be an entire liberty. . . . I am going 'within a few days, I tell thee, to set this city on fire. . . .

'I will pull down these lofty crowns which are exalted up to 'heaven; I come to throw them down into hell.'

At last this alarming appearance merged in the ludicrous, and Lacy having been rash enough to announce that he would raise a dead man from his grave on a certain day, his failure was the end of all. The French churches of London had passed a severe sentence upon the Camisards and their fraudulent or foolish fanaticism, 'both,' it was said, 'to prevent the reproach which 'those of the Romish communion might cast upon us, and to 'testify to the nation in whose bosom we have the happiness to 'live, that we have done what lay in our power to prevent this 'great scandal.' Many among the refugees, apprehending that the ill-omened predictions of their fanatical countrymen 'might 'bring all the nation into the displeasure of the English among 'whom they lived,' resolved to disturb their meetings, and by treating them with open contempt, to show clearly their own abhorrence of such practices. But though they had been excommunicated by the French consistories, and driven out of their assemblies by French mobs, they were nevertheless constantly styled 'the French prophets,' and remained in the public memory with that denomination, the discredit of which could not but fall more or less upon the entire colony. French prophets were soon appropriate subjects for popular comic songs. Tom D'Urfey, born himself from parents who had left La Rochelle to fly to England, wrote a farce, the heroes of which were the modern prophets; and Swift did not forget them in the predictions of Isaac Bickerstaff, which had been composed 'to prevent the people of England from being farther imposed 'on by vulgar almanac-makers.'

Next to these enterprising wanderers there was also an unceasingly moving set of intriguers, conspirers, and secret political agents, such as the Marquis de Guiscard, who, to revenge the disappointment of his insane ambition, attempted to stab Mr. Harley at a sitting of the council where he was to be examined upon his suspected treason. He had never been a Protestant, and he carried on his plans of civil war in France rather upon feudal notions than according to the ideas of his own time. But he was among the French pensioned by the English Government; and we need only read the contemporary narratives of his crime, to see how eagerly the opportunity was seized for making his countrymen favoured with the same bounty appear in an invidious light.

Last of all, the refugees themselves injured their own cause by interfering too much in the politics of their new country, and not observing the neutrality becoming settlers so recently natural-

ised. It was natural that they should take part with the Whigs against the Tories, when they saw the Tories rallying round the standard of Sacheverell, and plotting against the Protestant Succession, the best security of the refugees in England. But there were preachers in the French colony who proved as intemperate supporters of the right of revolutionary resistance as Dr. Sacheverell of the duty of passive obedience. In 1710, when new members were to be elected for Westminster, — in 1712, when the Duke of Marlborough was definitively dismissed from the Queen's favour, many of them did not conceal their bitter opposition to the Court. Moreover they quarrelled much among themselves upon the matter, as some did not approve of so much party spirit. The contest was kept up for years in a flow of libels, the French authors of which did not abstain from ridiculing one another. There we find pictures which look much like the portraits drawn by Addison and Hogarth, with such descriptions of club and coffee-house life that they seem to spend their whole time in places of public resort and amusement. We cannot help deriving the same impression from another contest which raged still later between the French Protestant consistories in London and 'the poor French converts of the Church 'of Rome being in holy orders.' After a long struggle the priests and monks who had passed from the Catholic to the Anglican Church had been admitted to partake of the royal bounty distributed since 1687 to the refugees. They were excluded in 1729, upon a representation to the Crown 'that many worthless 'and immoral persons came from France on purpose to have 'their share of the money.' This money was under the care of a French lay committee, the members of which were constantly exposed to the attacks of every one who deemed himself injured in the distribution of the fund. Such imputations must not be lightly credited; but they might at the time derive some countenance from books published by Malard or Dennis in 1720 and 1722, with titles such as this: — 'The spirit of the French 'Refugees manifested, . . . . wherein is set forth the insolence 'and ingratitude of the French Refugees towards the English, 'their benefactors; their domineering spirit and wickedness to-'wards the unhappy converts their countrymen; their fanatical 'discipline; their open endeavours to obstruct the glory of God, 'to engross to themselves his spiritual and universal king-'dom, &c.'

Nothing, however, would be more unfair than to judge the whole of the French Protestant settlement in England from these few examples of eccentric conduct. The common life of the great majority was less conspicuous and more regular. It

was only by steadily applying to the daily duties of their respective callings, that they were enabled to improve their circumstances, and to rise superior to popular prejudice. Many of the French Refugees made good fortunes in trade, and became the founders of families which still subsist among us. We subjoin an interesting description of the earnest and amiable character which was attributed in the middle of the last century, to the French Protestants of Ireland by a credible witness, Philip Skelton, the rector of Fintona. He was born and bred in the vicinity of the French colony of Lisburn. When new cruelties practised in 1751, by the Comte de Saint Priest, upon the Protestants of Languedoc, drove a fresh supply of refugees to Ireland, he tried to conciliate public sympathy in their favour, by writing an eulogistic account of the former settlers.

'I can boldly appeal,' says Skelton, 'to the experience of every 'one who knows them, whether, in point of private or civil and 'social virtue, they have not all along so behaved themselves as 'to deserve our love, our esteem and confidence. As to their 'private virtues, are they not sober, modest, industrious, and 'honest? Let us recollect how few instances since the last revo-'lution, of vile or profligate persons have been found among them 'throughout the nation. They do not profane God's name or his 'sabbath, they do not drink, debauch or game; they do not 'quarrel or break the peace like other men; they never meddle 'with other people's affairs, but when they are called, and then 'they show themselves to be the men of integrity and humanity. 'They do not overbear nor affect parade like their popish coun-'trymen, but confine themselves to their own business, which, 'in the midst of a truly Christian simplicity of manners, they 'pursue with admirable address and skill to the great advantage 'not only of themselves, but of the nation in general. The 'management of their gardens, houses, and tables affords us an 'useful example of neatness and good economy, and teaches us 'to live better than we otherwise could have done and at less 'expense. Their natural complaisance may help to polish our 'too great plainness, and that perpetual vivacity for which they 'are remarkable, may serve to temper the gloomy or melancholy 'turn of mind we complain so much of in ourselves.'

If from this general representation of the manners of the French Protestants in their adoptive country, we pass to their private annals, we find a gentleness and composure of domestic life, such, for instance, as appears in the Memoirs of Sir Samuel Romilly. The touching pages which Romilly, in the narrative of his early years, has dedicated to the remembrance of his father's small house at Marylebone; the recollections of the

familiar and affectionate society gathered round the fire in the little parlour, the walls of which were adorned with beautiful prints from the pictures of Claude, Caracci, Raphael, and Correggio; all these are vivid sketches of a set of men whom the peculiarity of their situation had marked with distinctive features. They had preserved the lively temper and elegant tastes of their original race, but acquired more sedate habits, more inclination to domestic enjoyments, a more serious sense of human life, than the majority of their former countrymen, for which they were indebted both to their previous condition in France and to the examples they had met abroad. Thus the following epitaph, though inscribed on a tombstone in the French church of Norwich, and consecrated to the son of one who had been among the original refugees, breathes a purely English spirit:—

'1784, August 30th, Paul Colombine, Esq., aged 85, descended 'from an ancient family in the province of Dauphiny in France. '. . . . . By temperance, industry, and moderation, through a 'long and blameless life, he had merited and obtained the best 'and sweetest of human blessings, health, competence, and 'content.'

The French congregations were thus insensibly absorbed in the English community, and the French mind was by degrees divested of its most characteristic national marks. In a sermon pronounced on the 3rd January, 1782, by Jacob Bourdillon, who had been fifty years a minister of a French church in London, we see the old preacher lamenting over the progressve extinction of the French flock and of the French language. Many years before, in 1735, the same regrets were already expressed by M. Cesar de Missy in the French church of the Patent, on the fast day instituted for the anniversary of the Revocation. 'By the waters of Babylon we sat down and wept' was the regular text of the annual sermon delivered on that occasion. It is curious to observe the perplexity of the preacher, bound to the traditional subject of the solemnity, when the feelings of the congregation have undergone so great a change. It is his official duty to cause his hearers to weep at the remembrance of Sion; but it is evident that they are no longer disposed to take France for Sion and England for Babylon. M. de Missy himself is so afraid of falling into any exaggeration, that he draws the most attractive pictures of the land of captivity, to which he ought to apply the gloomy lamentation of the psalmist; and when he comes to the terrible hope of revenge, the energetic expression of which doubtless accorded well with the feelings of the first refugees:—'O daughter of Babylon, happy shall he be,

'that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones!'—the good M. de Missy feels quite uneasy. He softens his text by mild interpretations, and the children of Edom are spared their allotted punishment.

The descendants of the refugees had in fact forgiven the injuries inflicted on their fathers: it was only a kind of melancholy pleasure for them to preserve, in the hospitable lands where they had been received, a faithful recollection of the country which had expelled them. By degrees, they renounced those instinctive ties which had maintained a secret attachment in their hearts for their original country. In England, in Holland, in Germany they had changed their native family names by translating them into the language of their true countrymen. They had cast off all the signs which could have reminded them of their descent; and when the ambition of Napoleon threatened again to subjugate all Europe, they were foremost, especially in Prussia, in showing their aversion to the French conqueror and the French conquest. Philip Skelton, whom we have already quoted, had, indeed, beautifully foretold the side they would join in such a contest. He replied to some English who suspected the fidelity of the refugees to England, on account of the affection they seemed to entertain for their former country, —'Let them love France in their hearts; we see they love 'these nations in their consciences, and the whole world knows 'their consciences have the entire ascendant over their hearts.'

We have dwelt upon the particulars of the French emigration in England, because they are matters of a more direct concern to us; but we do not intend to follow the refugees into all the countries where they found an asylum. Their settlement in Brandenburg having been managed by administrative measures, does not present the moving and varied aspect of the English colony. Switzerland, though much benefited by their dispersion, was perhaps more a thoroughfare and a place of meeting for most of them, than a place of abode where they could obtain much influence as a body. But the figure which the refugees make in Holland is so characteristic, and they were watched there and depicted with so much accuracy by a contemporary observer, that we cannot miss the opportunity of completing our outline of the exiled population with the information supplied by such a witness as Saurin. For the history of the most celebrated persons who fled to Holland in the first days of the emigration, we must refer to the excellent chapters of M. Sayous upon Bayle and Jurieu. But warned by M. Sayous himself, we shall go at once to Saurin, for the general condition of the refugees in Holland, which is more our especial

object. We regret that M. Weiss has not availed himself of the useful hint thrown out by M. Sayous about the importance of Saurin's sermons for the knowledge of the French society in Holland, and we will endeavour to make some amends for his omission.

Saurin says of one of his sermons, (and he might have said the same of many more) that he intended it to apply to his hearers; that it was the result of a continual observation of their habits and propensities for the twenty years he had dwelt among them; and with the bold spirit which rendered him so powerful a preacher, he exclaims: 'Do not suppose that any one of you who attend 'here, will frighten me by saying I have meant *his* house, *his* 'circle, *his* mode of life; for I grant him he is right, and the 'greater the scandal he creates, the more urgent is my duty to 'defend his brethren against the ill effect of his example.' *

We have, therefore, a gallery of contemporary portraits in the sermons of Saurin; and some of them so plainly marked, that his hearers sometimes started at the unpleasant likeness. These sermons were for many years the whole of the preacher's life; they were of great moment in his daily intercourse with his congregation, a constant matter of discussion nearly as much as of edification. Preaching obtained a larger space in the public worship of the Reformed Churches, in proportion as they departed farther from the ritual liturgy and ceremonial service of the Catholic ages. It had, moreover, a peculiar importance for a congregation of exiles, who, during many years, could only feel their national and social feelings revived when they were gathered around a native pulpit in a foreign country. Saurin himself expostulates in one place with his hearers for minding nothing but the sermons at church, and for not sustaining their attention or observing a proper behaviour while the prayers, the ten commandments, and the lessons were read.* A complete perusal of his once attractive sermons would be a heavy task for our days, but still it is not difficult to understand why they were regarded with so deep an interest in his time when we see how closely they bore upon the contemporary feelings and circumstances.

Jacques Saurin was born at Nimes in 1677, and educated at Geneva, whither his family had been driven by the Revocation. At the age of seventeen years he had left the academy for the regiment of the Earl of Galway; but after a campaign in which he distinguished himself and got promoted for a brilliant achievement, the young cornet returned to his former studies, and entered the church. He then went to England, was appointed one

* Sermons, vol. vi. p. 197.

of the ministers of the Walloon congregation in London, and there he married. In 1705 he passed from London to the Hague, where having been invested with an extraordinary situation as *ministre des nobles*, he remained till his death in 1730, and spent these twenty-five years in the constant discharge of his pastoral duties.*

This was a time very different from the previous period of the French emigration. The excitement caused by the sceptical criticisms of Bayle, and by the tempestuous domination of Jurieu had nearly subsided. Bayle died in 1706. Jurieu's last years † faded away in a sort of discredit. On the other hand, the great theological dispute which had divided the Calvinist body during the whole of the seventeenth century, about the certainty of grace and the means of salvation, was at an end, even in this very country where its violence had been greatest. The general progress of rational philosophy had weakened the sway which the fundamental argument of the Calvinistic doctrine exercised over the conscience. The hard principle of a predestined damnation and an indefeasible justification had been assuaged or eluded even by the divines who still professed to support it, and the primitive rigour of the doctrine was, in one way or other, concealed or excused. The Arminians, or such as advocated similar notions of man's merit and liberty in his relation to God, had been admitted to a standing of perfect equality with the orthodox communion, and the spirit of toleration had turned the canons fulminated at Dort against them into a dead letter. There was no longer any warlike sound, like that of the battles fought by Jurieu, either for the Gomarists and the strict observance of orthodox Calvinism, or against Bayle and the free thinkers, all, as he thought, embodied in his personal enemy.

Meantime, in Holland as well as in England, the refugees were forgetting their regret for their native country, and were losing their ardour for revenge. They enjoyed the declining prospects of the great reign, and the misfortunes of the great king, with the bitter satisfaction of old sufferers to whom justice has at last been done; but little now remained of the anxiety with which, before the peace of Ryswick, they looked out for a favourable turn in their affairs; and when the peace of Utrecht was concluded without any condition for their reinstatement, they became every day more accustomed to think of France as of a foreign country. The thirty years included between the Revocation and the death of Louis XIV. had brought forth a fresh set of men for whom Holland was less a land of exile

* Sermons, vol. vii. p. 75.

† He died in 1713.

than of hospitality; for many, the land of their birth. They had entered into closer connexion with Dutch affairs and habits; they could not, however, but preserve much of their original nature, and being no longer under the pressure of the harsh circumstances which had altered the French character in the French Protestants, they returned insensibly to some of their national tendencies.

Such was the generation which Saurin addressed, and its characteristics are stamped in his sermons. The impoverished fugitives have become wealthy merchants and citizens. The first calamities of their exodus are no longer mentioned, except as proud reminiscences of obstacles overcome through the assistance of God, or as grounds of reproach against their Protestant brethren who did not dare to partake of their glorious trials. The wonderful opulence of Holland; the large share in it which had fallen to the lot of the refugees; the benefit of living under the rule of law, instead of bearing an arbitrary yoke; the peculiarities of the mutual intercourse between the two nations,—these are subjects upon which Saurin often expatiates. His congregation was never exclusively French; people of both races were sitting together under his pulpit, and he took every opportunity of making them acceptable to each other. He expressed the gratitude of the French to the Dutch; the latter he cautioned against being too much offended by the difference between the French character and theirs; the former, against any remissness in the fulfilment of their public duties towards their adopted country.

We know no clearer and more intelligent testimony borne to the material progress of the French refugees abroad than that furnished by Saurin's allusions. But with the progress of material well being and security, the private and the public life of this second generation of confessors had been already changed for the worse. Saurin warns them at every page of his sermons against the fatal consequences of their relaxed discipline and virtue; and, though he was a severe censor of his contemporaries, it is not less curious to see how the Calvinistic morals, even in the sanctuary of exile, had departed from the puritanic ideal of Geneva. This ideal, indeed, Saurin would have established in Holland, had it not been an impossible attempt to force the sumptuary laws and monastic regimen of Geneva upon that great mercantile community, upon an emporium open to the cupidity and appetites of all the world.

In the midst of their luxuries, however, many of his flock devoted themselves to the study of the casuists and controversialists of their own church; a study from which they derived

much comfort, since doctors of the most extreme Calvinistic orthodoxy had devised sure means of securing tranquillity to the conscience without rendering either the principles of belief less rigid or the paths of life more rough. The fundamental principle of the Gomarist school was the impossibility of losing the justification once granted to the elect, and of being justified otherwise than by the predeterminate election of God. The refined logic of certain doctors upon this principle was that, grace being irresistible, there was no risk to run by resisting; but, on the contrary, the greater the resistance to the gifts of God, the more abundantly would God impart his gifts; that grace being a gratuitous mercy, no condition was required for enjoying the mercy of God, the merits of Christ being so effectual as to dispense the Christian from the necessity of any exertion. Such subtleties Saurin encountered with the straight rectitude of his sound sense and sound heart. He professed himself a faithful adherent to the Genevese communion, an adversary of the Lutherans and Arminians; he would not hear of any alteration in the orthodox faith, but he would not evade its hardest consequences by metaphysical refinements. The most beautiful sermons of Saurin are those in which he considers these awful difficulties of the Calvinistic faith, and refusing to alleviate them by any approach to some less absolute doctrine about predestination, he takes his refuge against his own and his hearers' perplexity in the humble adoration of the divine profundity:—'How unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways 'past finding out!' This is the text upon which he preaches with the greatest eloquence, because it is the most comforting thought to his soul. And what was the practical conclusion which he derived from having so candidly acknowledged 'the 'depth of God's wisdom,' and the unfitness of 'the thing formed 'saying to Him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?' It was a precept of mutual forbearance and charitable toleration.

The uncharitable, intolerant Christians he often censures, as if he had a sad presentiment of the troubles which were to disturb the end of his life. Sectarian intolerance was no longer in Holland the violent passion it had been there in the previous century; but much of it remained as a fit aliment to the habits of slander and the petty jealousies which infested the small circle of the French colony. Preachers had to undergo the strictures of their flocks or of their professional rivals. Saurin, notwithstanding his well-intentioned zeal, was the victim of that sort of provincial malice, which he felt, perhaps, more keenly than it was worth. Many of his brother clergymen decried the distinguished urbanity of his manners as

more becoming a man of the world than a churchman. On the other hand, his thorough acquaintance with mankind had perhaps, given too sharp an edge to his moral criticisms; and the personal animadversions with which he interspersed his sermons were not likely to secure him the easy popularity of an inoffensive teacher. A series of letters, *Upon the State of Christianity in France*, some passages of which were thought too severe, were the last work of Saurin, and the cause of many attacks against him. His adversaries searched his former books for censurable passages, and succeeded in finding a few words to which exception might be taken in the folios he had written upon the Bible. He was condemned by two successive synods, and died a short time afterwards of grief and vexation.

His last work, which was never finished, had been begun for a special purpose. He had intended to make an earnest appeal to the Protestants who had remained in France, and to press upon them the duty of leaving a country where they were denied their most sacred rights. He did not live long enough to go to the full length of his scheme; but the idea which he pursued with his last efforts, was one which he had entertained during the whole of his pastoral career. He constantly threw the most decided blame upon those of his brethren who, pretending that they continued faithful in their hearts to their creed, still preferred submitting at home to the daily practices of apostacy, rather than securing the peace and liberty of their consciences by settling abroad. In many sermons of Saurin we see the men of that description urged with a pathetic solicitude to choose a better path, or taunted with the utmost severity for their low-spirited procrastination. He calls them temporisers; he compares them to Nicodemus, who only dared to go to Jesus by night. The unhappy converts had, in fact, always preserved some relics of their former worship, which they concealed under the enforced observances of their new church. Some even contrived to repair to the French colonies in the Protestant countries for a short visit, and there to take, or, as Saurin says, to extort the sacrament, being not the less resolved to return immediately afterwards to their abode of servitude. Saurin condemned this cautious lukewarmness, and disapproved these circuitous methods, by which their integrity could not be but seriously endangered. He did not even consent to supply these timid brethren with the pious directions which they begged from him. He answered, that he would not have them believe that they adequately performed their religious duties, when they concealed their religious profession.

He was, in short, a great promoter of emigration for principle's sake; he considered it as the last resource of a defeated cause and of a sincere conscience against thorough-going oppression. His favourite text was taken from the mystic words of the Apocalypse, which he turned into a rule of practical conduct, '— Come out of Babylon, my people, that ye be not partakers 'of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.'

We would not undertake to support the argument of Saurin to its full extent, and to condemn the great majority of the Protestants who remained in France under the conditions which Saurin considered so opprobrious. In fact, had all the French Protestants abandoned their country in answer to his appeal, Protestantism would have been extinguished by the very consistency of its adherents, in a land where, after a time, it was re-established. But these are questions which must be left to the decision of each man's conscience. Only let no man imagine himself called upon to stifle that sacred voice within under the pretence of better working out the mysterious designs of Providence. We are the more lenient towards the temporisers and Nicodemites against whom Saurin inveighed so loudly, as we know that they did not reason upon that slippery principle which has been of late years introduced into the world, and has, indeed, become a commonplace among the nations afflicted with frequent revolutionary visitations. Had the temporisers of the seventeenth century lived in the nineteenth, it is probable that they would have uttered the same sublime cant with which many a man on the Continent has greeted every recent revolution; they would have proclaimed that they belonged to their country before all; that they ought to reserve themselves for its service; that though they did not approve of forcing the conscience, yet their consciences would not be perverted by an outward compliance with the oppressors, and they would reserve themselves for a better epoch; that they would be better fitted for liberty after having had a long experience of bondage; that in the majority there was a divine sign, and the voice of the people could not be but the voice of God. We cannot conceal that we prefer the candour of the old generation of Frenchmen, in spite of the rebukes of Saurin. They confessed their weakness, and did not dogmatise upon it for their glorification. They acknowledged the demoralising power of the material bonds which bound them to a country to which they were no longer attached by any moral ties; they did not boast of their chains. And besides, many among them went to pay their homage to the true faith in those *churches of the desert*, which, for many a long year, nobody attended but at the risk of his liberty and his life.

ART. IV. — *Memoirs, Journal, and Correspondence of Thomas Moore.* Edited by the Right Honourable Lord JOHN RUSSELL, M.P. Vols. I. to VI. 8vo. London: 1853.

To those who, like ourselves, are verging upon their 'grand 'climacteric' (all the world knows we were born in 1802), these volumes cannot fail to afford many an hour of delightful and interesting reading. We confess to having been absorbed in the retrospective details of a period which, in a social and literary point of view, had so much to distinguish it; details sketched by one who floated on the tide of pleasurable existence in both these forms, and whose capacity for enjoyment seems to have kept pace with his opportunities.

Like many men of ardent sensibility, Thomas Moore had a vivid conception of the value of posthumous celebrity. To be able to interest his fellow men and women in his personal feelings, in his pleasures and pains, his triumphs and successes, was with Moore an object of undisguised solicitude; and to this we are indebted, in great part, though not entirely, for a minute record of his almost daily life, his innermost thoughts, and his relations with society during the meridian of his existence. If it be objected — as, indeed, we have already heard it objected — to this publication, that it is little else than 'a tissue of egotistical, 'vain, and trivial passages in the life of an improvident, selfish 'adventurer,' the answer would be, that all autobiography, to be worth reading at all, must be egotistical and vain; because nobody would take so much trouble except for the sake of being allowed to talk of themselves all through the work, and to dwell, *ad libitum*, upon their own merits and achievements. The use of the personal pronoun has long been, by a very natural instinct of self-protection, restricted within narrow limits by the higher classes of society; hence poor Moore could not *talk* of his own glory and successes whilst alive, and it was a hard case, considering how much he had to be vain of. To fly to his closet, and record the flattering incidents of the day, was his best and most obvious resource. By thus 'entering up' the tributes as they poured in, little and great, Moore indemnified himself, by anticipation, for the suppression of all signs of present pride and satisfaction. And since we have discovered incontrovertible evidence in these volumes of the prodigious amount of praise and flattery heaped upon his head, our wonder — recollecting how unaffectedly he bore his honours — becomes greater and greater as we read.

Until the appearance of this publication, it had not, indeed, been fully present to us how extensively Moore was read and relished, nor how widely his reputation, whether as a poet, as a wit, a lyric composer, or, God save the mark, a sound political writer! had circulated, in Europe as well as in the British Isles. Yet it cannot be denied, with the proofs before us, that in each of these walks of composition, Thomas Moore was regarded with enthusiastic admiration by his contemporaries, throughout the social scale, from the 'man of letters' proper down to the 'Miss 'in her teens.' And as to personal successes, no one, surely, ever surpassed him. By his touching, sentimental singing, he enchanted all who were susceptible to the charms of music; by his vivacity, sparkling conversation, and literary accomplishments, he captivated those who prized social talents; whilst his more solid merits secured for him a place in the esteem and friendly regard of some of our most celebrated countrymen. Add to these sources of honourable gratification, the remarkable fact that Moore enjoyed, and deserved to enjoy, his own self-respect, and cherished his mental independence throughout all vicissitudes of life, and we have before us perhaps the amplest justification of human vanity which purely personal qualities can well furnish.

A general outline of Thomas Moore's life will, we apprehend, be acceptable to most of our readers. Born in 1779, of decent, but obscure, Irish parentage, in Dublin, he had the advantage of being the son of a clever, active-minded woman, who seems to have steadily kept in view the main purpose of forcing education upon the boy, as far as her slender means could serve. Moore disliked study, and would much rather have sought his fortune as an actor. But Mrs. Moore compelled him, with her firm, yet affectionate, authority, to acquire such an amount of learning as should qualify him to make his way in some one of the walks of educated labour. This purpose accomplished, by his having graduated at Trinity College, Dublin, young Moore quitted the parental roof, and, at the age of nineteen, dropped down into a humble London lodging near Portman Square, with but a small sum of money in his pocket, and with a faint intention of reading for the bar. He possessed scarcely any friends, and knew nobody of any mark in the world, but after a while contrived, by means of some letters of introduction he had brought from Dublin, to gain admission into a few families (chiefly Irish, however,) where he could pass his evenings and occasionally dine. After getting himself admitted of the Middle Temple, he went back to Dublin for a space, but shortly returned to London (in 1799), with the double

object of prosecuting his legal studies and of procuring subscriptions to his translation of the 'Odes of Anacreon;' the latter endeavour was, by the fortunate accident of Dr. Lawrence pronouncing a favourable judgment upon the work, attended with unlooked-for success. At this period Moore makes the acquaintance of Lord Moira (also by letters of recommendation from Irish friends), who takes kind notice of him, and asks him to his country seat, Donington Park. With the Marquis of Lansdowne, too (the father of the present peer), he becomes acquainted, by soliciting his subscription to the 'Anacreon,' which Lord Lansdowne consents to give, and adds an invitation to young Moore to call upon him in London. The 'Anacreon' comes out at length, with a brilliant list of patrons' names attached to it, and makes a decided 'hit.' Moore becomes a 'Lion,' is *fêté* in fashionable circles, gets introduced to the Prince of Wales (to whom, by the way, the 'Anacreon' was dedicated, 'by permission'), pays a visit at Donington Park, is so much liked there that it is with difficulty he can get away; and, in short, finds himself completely launched upon the great world. Here are extracts from letters addressed to his mother early in 1801, at the age of two-and-twenty: —

'My Dearest Mother,— You may imagine I do not want society here, when I tell you that last night I had *six* invitations. Everything goes on swimmingly with me. I dined with the Bishop of Meath on Friday last, and went to a party at Mrs. Crewe's in the evening. My songs have taken *such* a rage! even surpassing what they did in Dublin. . . . .

'There is not a night that I have not three parties on my string, but I take Hammersley's advice and send showers of apologies. The night before last, Lady Harrington sent her servant after me to two or three places, with a ticket for the "Ancient Music," which is the king's concert, and which is so select, that those who go to it ought to have been at court before. Lady H. got the ticket from one of the princesses, and the servant at last found me where I dined,' &c. &c.

. . . . 'Never was there any wight so idly busy as I am. Nothing but racketting; it is, indeed, too much, and I intend stealing at least a fortnight's seclusion, by leaving word at my door that I am gone into the country. I last night went to a little supper after the Opera, where the Prince and Mrs. Fitzherbert were; I was introduced to her. . . . .

'I dine with Lord Moira to-morrow, and go in the evening with Lady Charlotte to an assembly at the Countess of Cork's. . . . .

'I assure you I am six feet high to-day, after discharging my debt of 70*l.* yesterday, and I have still some copies on my hand to dispose of for myself. The new edition will soon be out,' &c. . . . .

"I was last night at a ball — everybody was there — two or three of the princes, the statholder, &c. &c. You may imagine the affa-

bility of the Prince of Wales, when his address to me was, "How do "you do, Moore? I am glad to see you." . . . .

'I go on as usual; I am happy, careless, comical,—every thing I could wish: not very rich, nor yet quite poor; all I desire is that my dear ones at home may be as contented and easy in mind as I am.' . . . .

Such an extraordinary start into popularity and favour with the London world afforded the young poet of two-and-twenty a hopeful glance into a literary career, and he seems accordingly to have neglected the pursuit of 'Grim gribber' for the flowery paths of imaginative composition. In this mood he gladly avails himself of Lord Moira's kind hospitality, and spends three or four weeks alone at Donington, storing his mind by assiduous reading, for which a fine library supplied ample resources. Strange to say, during this studious seclusion Moore appears to have had but slender longings after the excitement of the London *salons:* and evidences are thickly strewn throughout the pages of his Diary that a taste for rational and even simple occupations was not wanting when his friends would permit him its exercise.

Lord Moira was not long in procuring for his countryman, what was hailed by the latter as a piece of most gratifying good fortune, the appointment of Registrar of the Admiralty Court of Bermuda. In spite of the sneers with which this piece of preferment has been mentioned, as having been productive of more injury than benefit to the recipient, Moore himself never regarded it but with becoming gratitude towards his noble patron. He thus writes to his mother on learning the news of his appointment:—

'September 12. 1803.

'My Dearest Mother,—I enclose you a note I received from Merry yesterday, by which you will perceive that every thing is in train for my departure. Nothing could be more lucky. . . . .

'Heaven smiles upon my project, and I see nothing in it now but hope and happiness. . . . .

'If I did not make a shilling by it, the new character it gives to my pursuits, the claim it affords me upon Government, the absence I shall have from all the frippery follies that would hang upon my career for ever in this country,—all these are objects invaluable in themselves, abstracted from the pecuniary. . . . .

'My dear father should write to Carpenter, and thank him for the very friendly assistance he has given me; without that assistance, the breeze would be fair in vain for *me*,' &c. &c.

After a year's absence, chiefly at his post in the confessedly delicious island of Bermuda, but making besides an agreeable tour in the United States and in Canada, in his way to embark for England, Moore returned, to the undisguised joy of all his friends. He was allowed to appoint a deputy in his place at

Bermuda, and began to turn his mind to bookmaking as a means of earning money. On Mr. Pitt's death a new political combination seemed to promise some advantage to Moore, and, in fact, Lord Moira did obtain the comfortable berth of Barrack Master in Dublin for the father, pending some suitable promotion in favour of the son. The latter, on the *qui vive* of expectation, writes to his friend, Miss Godfrey (July, 1806), 'Lord Moira has told me that the commissionership intended 'for me is to be in Ireland, and that if there are any such 'appointments, I am to have one of them. Such are my plans, 'and such are my hopes. I wait but for the arrival of the '"Edinburgh Review," and then "a long farewell to all my '"greatness." London shall never see me act the farce of 'gentlemanship in it any more,' &c. &c.

The 'Edinburgh Review' arrives, and contains, to Moore's infinite mortification, a somewhat contemptuous notice of his new production (Odes and Epistles).

Hence the well-known duel with Jeffrey; or, rather, the prelude to one, for the belligerent parties were interrupted by peace officers. And at this point of Moore's history there enters upon the scene one whose constant kindness, whose undeviating attachment, friendly counsel and assistance, must be counted among the most precious possessions of the poet throughout his life. We allude to Mr. Rogers, who stepped in to offer bail for Moore's appearance if called upon. However, the less that is added about this silly affair the better. The would-be combatants became firm friends within a year or two, and when Moore's unfortunate affair of the Bermuda defalcation fell out (in 1818), Jeffrey was among the first to tender his contribution in aid.

We gather from the 'letters' that Moore spent great part of the years 1807-8 at Donington Park, by permission of its usually absent lord, amusing himself, and working at the same time, on divers literary projects. 'I read' (he says to Miss Godfrey in a letter dated March 1807) 'much more than 'I write, and think much more than either.' Again to his mother (April in this year):—'The time flies over me as swift 'as if I was in the midst of dissipation, which is a tolerable 'proof that I am armed for either field, for folly or for thought. 'The family do not talk of coming till June, and if that be the 'case, I shall not budge.'

But few letters are to be found relating to the period from 1807 to 1811 inclusive*, which Moore seems to have distributed

* Two of these letters, of the year 1809, have recently been published by Mr. Croker, in which Moore asks his friend, the newly-

between Donington Park, Dublin, and lodgings in London. We learn, however, by looking into his 'Notices of the Life of 'Lord Byron,' that it was in the autumn of the year 1811 that he formed the acquaintance of that distinguished genius. It arose out of a little epistolary skirmish between them about a supposed imputation upon Moore's veracity, which ended by an offer from the noble poet (having meanwhile 'explained' it to the satisfaction of his correspondent) to meet him on amicable terms. It was at the dinner-table of Mr. Rogers that Byron and Moore first came together; the fourth member of the party being Thomas Campbell, who (as was, indeed, the case with the host himself) also enjoyed Lord Byron's company on that day for the first time.

This memorable introduction between Moore and Byron resulted in an intimacy and an attachment on both sides, which never lost its charm to the latest moment of Byron's existence. The rapidity with which their mutual friendship grew up was somewhat extraordinary, as Moore himself admits. But it is not so surprising when we recall the captivations of Moore's society on the one side, and the admiration Byron excited in the breast of 'Anacreon' on the other; opportunities of meeting were furnished in abundance, since they frequented the same circles, and were at this period both plunged in dissipation and folly; that is to say, in 1812, and again in the London season of 1813, wherein Lord Byron's fame first rose to its full height (on the appearance of 'Childe Harold'), and the London world pursued him with the most extravagant homage and adulation. Moore's Life of Byron tells us, indeed, more of himself at this stage of history than is revealed by the present publication, whilst Lord Byron's fondness for his friend's company is thus attested: 'Moore, the epitome,' writes Byron to another friend, 'of all that is exquisite in personal or poetical 'accomplishments.'*

---

appointed Secretary to the Admiralty, to assist him in arranging the sale of his Bermuda appointment to his deputy. The proposal is, of course, indefensible, and Mr. Croker very properly refused to afford any facility for an illegal transaction of this nature: but when we consider that the office was a sinecure, that the duties were performed by the deputy, and that the experience of Ireland before the Union must have rendered such arrangements familiar to Moore's mind, we cannot greatly wonder at his addressing this request to his countryman, then recently promoted to an English office. Moore's letters are written in December. Mr. Croker had been appointed in the previous October.

* Life of Byron, vol. ii. p. 95.

During one of Moore's Irish trips he formed part of that famed theatrical society which figured on the Kilkenny boards; the male actors being amateurs, and the female ones mostly if not all professional, having at their head the 'star' of the hour, the celebrated Miss O'Neil. Moore acted well, especially in comedy, as we have been informed by one who was fortunate enough to witness those remarkable performances about the year 1810. Among other parts, his personation of 'Mungo,' in the agreeable opera of 'The Padlock,' was, it is said, eminently happy.

Two sisters, both of them extremely attractive in person, as well as irreproachable in conduct, also formed a part of this 'corps,' acting, singing, and ever and anon dancing, to the delight of their audience. With one of these beauties Moore fell desperately in love, and being regarded favourably in return by Miss Elizabeth Dyke, he a few months later united himself with her in marriage, without, it would seem, acquainting his parents with his intention. The ceremony took place at St. Martin's church in London in March 1811, and Mrs. Thomas Moore was introduced to her husband's London friends during the same spring. By these she was cordially received, although there was but one opinion among them as to the imprudence of the step in Moore's notoriously narrow circumstances.

Not to lose his privilege of using Donington library, the young couple established themselves in a small cottage at Kegworth, within a few miles of the park, Moore working continually in the library for many months. But towards the end of 1812 all hopes of advancement through the favour of Lord Moira, after many an anxious ebb and flow, finally vanished. That nobleman, whose affairs had become irremediably embarrassed, came to a compromise, as may be said, with his political principles. Not liking to throw them overboard, by joining a Government resolutely opposed to Catholic emancipation, he judged it consistent with his honour to accept at its hands the Governor-generalship of India, which he endeavoured to persuade his friends to regard as more a military than a civil appointment. On learning Lord Moira's acceptance of this splendid post, both Moore and his friends appear to have cherished an expectation that his Lordship would propose to take Moore with him to India in some capacity or another, whereby his fortunes might be materially improved. One can hardly comprehend how 'friends' such as Miss Godfrey and Lady Donegal, for instance, or, indeed, how Moore himself, could have failed to perceive that Lord Moira, the avowed inti-

mate of the Regent, owing this appointment to the personal will and protection of his royal master, was utterly incapacitated from extending his patronage to the notorious satirist of that master. Without going so far as to ascribe to the Prince any *interposition* in the matter, the simple fact of Moore's having kept up a running fire of ridicule and amused the town with lampoons against the Regent, for many months previous, ought, we should have imagined, to have been amply sufficient to account for Lord Moira's conduct.* And when we recall the peculiarly stinging and personal quality of those epigrammatic thrusts, we may doubt whether the objects of his satires would admit the truth of Lord John's description of them, when he says, in a note referring to the 'Twopenny Post-bag,' that 'they are full of fun and humour, but without ill-nature.'†

But whatever he felt or his friends thought about this constructive desertion on the part of Lord Moira, the truth was that Moore found himself thereby completely cast adrift upon

* The following entry, under Dec. 19. 1825, throws some illustration upon Lord Moira's reasons for the course which he took on this occasion:—"The night before last I received a letter from Crampton, 'enclosing one from Shaw (the Lord Lieutenant's secretary), the purport of which was, that the Lord Lieutenant meant to continue my 'father's half-pay in the shape of a pension to my sister. Resolved, 'of course, to decline this favour, but wrote a letter full of thankfulness to Crampton. Find since that this was done at Crampton's 'suggestion: *that Lord Wellesley spoke of the difficulty there was in 'the way, from the feelings the King most naturally entertained to-'wards me, and from himself being the personal friend of the King,* 'but that, on further consideration, he saw he could do it without any 'reference to the other side of the Channel, and out of the pension 'fund placed at his disposal as Lord Lieutenant.' (Vol. v. p. 24.)

† In the preface to Moore's ninth vol. of 'Works,' &c., the author takes pains to disavow having been actuated by any malignant feeling against the Government of that day; and, indeed, seeks to excuse himself by saying he wrote these squibs as party missiles, without wishing any harm to their subjects; adding, that the late Lord Holland also regretted the acrimony with which the Whig party waged their warfare in 1812 and following years against the Prince, his government, and friends. We are inclined to credit Moore's assertion, that he himself was visited with something like self-reproach, twenty years later; whilst, that Lord Holland, whose generous soul was incapable of harbouring resentful emotions after the occasion was past, should have looked back upon former enmities and political conflicts with unaffected regret, is not surprising. But, this admission made, we are bound to say that the poet, as well as the peer, *were* engaged in cordial combination for party ends, with the most violent of their political allies.

the waters, shipwrecked and disheartened. Nevertheless he so far compressed his feelings of disappointment, as to speak of his patron's past kindnesses and good offices as 'sealing his lips' against complaint. (Vol. i. p. 323.) On quitting England for the East, Lord Moira sent Moore fifteen dozen of his choicest wine as a parting token of regard.

Nothing could be more natural under the circumstances than that the poor poet should find in Holland House a 'harbour of 'refuge' in his distress. Admitted to familiar intimacy with the distinguished society which habitually met within those time-honoured walls, he became more and more attached to the Whig party, and exerted his talents in its service with renewed vigour, producing at intervals (in the columns of 'The Morning 'Chronicle') some of the most pungent and humorous satires which political warfare has ever engendered. They were extensively circulated and relished at the time, and are perhaps destined to be remembered as *chefs-d'œuvre* of their kind, after his other works shall be forgotten.

On this passage in Moore's career much censure has been pronounced,—even more than the case called for, we think. He who combines party warfare with pecuniary profit may expose himself to a certain measure of moral reprobation. Party warfare, however, must be carried on by the pen as well as by the tongue; and writers for the public cannot always exercise their craft gratuitously. Moore himself felt at times pricks of conscience at writing lampoons which were to be paid for, but salved over the sore by reflecting (and with some justice too) that his 'squibs' served to promote a good cause.

We find Mr. and Mrs. Moore in 1813 at another and more attractive little dwelling, called Mayfield, near Ashbourne, at which Mr. Rogers pays them a friendly visit. And now children begin to cluster about the poor Poet's hearth, whilst his wife's health, being delicate and weak to a deplorable degree, gives him much uneasiness, as, in fact, it continued to do throughout the whole of his life. No topic, always excepting that of Lord Lansdowne (who is the 'Protagonist' of the 'Diary') is half so often recurred to as the unhappiness which 'Bessy's' bad health occasions him.

Although intent upon his long-meditated task, 'Lalla 'Rookh,' Moore contrived to support himself and his growing family by means of newspaper *facetiæ*, humorous satires, 'Melodies,' and songs (an opera was even composed), from 1811 to 1817. His connexion with Richard Power, the musical publisher in the Strand, was for years his main stay, and a 'bill upon Power,' to be taken up or not (as the case might be)

when due, by the efforts of his pen and his fancy, was the regular issue out of every embarrassment (and they were not few) which occurred.

A letter written in 1812 furnishes a tolerably clear notion of the position in which Moore's affairs stood after the downfall of his prospects of advancement:—

'My Dearest Mother, — I have not had an answer from Dalby yet, but am in the same mind about retiring *somewhere*, and I should prefer Donington, both from the society and the library. . . . .

'I don't know whether I told you before (and if I did not, it was my uncertainty about it for some time which prevented me), that the Powers give me between them *five hundred* a year for my music; the agreement is for seven years, and as much longer as I chose to say. . . . . So you see, darling mother! my prospect is by no means an unpromising one, and the only sacrifice I must make, is the giving up London society, which involves me in great expenses, and leaves me no time for the industry that alone would enable me to support them; this I shall do without the least regret.' (*Memoirs*, vol. i. p. 274.)

The long-promised work, after prodigious brain-spinning and careful polishing, made its appearance in 1817, fully realising the expectations entertained of it by the public, for a more complete success has rarely attended an author. 'Lalla Rookh' was universally read, admired, and praised. It was dramatised at Berlin, and acted there by the Court itself, translated into more than one European language, as well as into Persian, and, in short, enjoyed a reign of more than average duration in the realms of literature. The 'Letters' teem with testimonies to its extraordinary attraction, and these, too, from superior judges of literary merit. This may appear surprising to some of the readers of fiction of the present day, for whom the adventures, sorrows, and even loves, of such fanciful and poetical beings might probably yield but slight interest: possibly less than those of the green-grocer or factory-spinner. But thirty-five years necessarily bring altered tastes upon their wing.

In one short year after this imaginative tale came out, Moore writes (under date of March 1818) to his mother, "They will 'soon go to press with a seventh edition of "Lalla Rookh."' Messrs. Longman paid the author no less than three thousand guineas for the copyright. It was dedicated to Mr. Rogers, to whom, indeed, it was in great measure indebted for its origin. 'The subject,' writes Moore to his friend Dalton in 1814, 'is one of Rogers's suggesting, and so far I am lucky, for it 'quite enchants me; and, if what old Dionysius the critic says 'be true, that it is impossible to write disagreeably upon agree-

'able subjects, I am not without hopes that I shall do some-'thing which will not disgrace me.'

The sum Moore received for 'Lalla Rookh,' though large, did not conduce so much as might have been supposed to his independence. Writing to Mrs. Moore (his mother) in 1817, he says, 'I am to draw a thousand pounds for the discharge of my 'debts, and to leave the other two thousand in their hands '(receiving a bond for it). . . . . The annual interest upon this (which is a hundred pounds) my father is to draw upon 'them for quarterly, and this, I hope, with his half-pay, will 'make you tolerably comfortable. By this arrangement, you 'see, I do not touch a sixpence of the money for my own pre-'sent use. . . . .'

Ashbourne was now abandoned, and Moore took a cottage at Hornsey. 'Living in London is what I do not now like at all,' he says to his mother (May 1817). About this same date he writes to her of a 'dinner' he had been at; and adds, 'It will 'amuse you to find that Croker was the person that gave my 'health. I could not have a better proof of the station which 'I hold in the public eye than that Croker should claim friend-'ship with me before such men as Peel, the Duke of Cumber-'land, &c. &c. I was received with very flattering enthusiasm 'by the meeting. . . . .'

Having, as he conceived, earned a claim to enjoy a holiday, by the achievement of his task, Moore set off, in company with his friend Mr. Rogers, on a trip to Paris. During the first few years which followed upon the peace of 1815, there was a positive dislocation of English society, caused by the eager rush of our countrymen across the Channel. A long privation of the delights of continental travel had whetted the appetite for such enjoyments, and the English moved off in masses, resembling, it might be said, nothing so much as the break up of the 'Polar Pack.' Moore, like the rest, becomes enchanted with Paris, and writes home, 'If I can persuade 'Bessy to the measure, it is my intention to come and live here 'for two or three years.' However, on his return, which took place a few weeks later, the loss of a child (being the second blow of the kind), checked all projects of foreign residence. A cottage within a walk of Bowood shortly after offering an eligible 'perch,' the mourners removed to that humble, yet pleasant home in which the poet was fated to end his days; the happiest of which, probably, after all, may be said to have been passed whilst master of Sloperton Cottage.

An unlooked-for calamity, which occurred in the following year, clouded over his prospects just as Moore was beginning to

see his way to independence and honourable ease. The Bermuda deputy absconded with the proceeds of a ship and cargo deposited in his hands, for which Moore was held answerable. There was, indeed, one consoling circumstance which lessened the general gloom of his position, namely, the cordial and numerous offers of assistance tendered by generous friends.

But although he was, as might be supposed, wholly unequal to deal with the embarrassments he saw thickening around him, he resolutely declined pecuniary aid, and determined to work out his own redemption by the industrious application of his individual talents. (Vol. ii. p. 85.) The history of this long, but, fortunately, effectual struggle, it were superfluous to recapitulate here; but the issue may be stated as having been highly creditable to Moore's sense of self-respect and integrity of character. The only friend who, as we believe, eventually enjoyed the privilege of contributing to his enfranchisement, was the noble editor of these volumes; the poet permitting him to apply towards the extinction of his Bermuda obligations a sum of 200*l.*, the produce of his Lordship's own literary labours.

The 'Diary' commences with the month of August, 1818, a few months after the Bermuda misfortune had happened; and gives indications of Moore's being already engaged upon his 'Life of Sheridan.' Notwithstanding the uneasy state of mind in which he lived at this time, from apprehensions of a prison hanging over him, such was the indomitable cheerfulness of the man, that he writes to Lady Donegal from his new home (in May, 1818):—'For nothing but to gratify my poor mother, would 'I leave just now my sweet, quiet cottage, where, in spite of 'proctors, deputies, and all other grievances, I am as happy as, 'I believe, this world will allow any one to be; and if I could 'but give the blessing of health to the dear cottager by my side, 'I would defy the devil and all his works, and Sir William 'Scott to boot.' (Vol. ii. p. 137.)

An inexhaustible flow of spirits, coupled with a boundless elasticity of character and a sanguine temper, proved through life Moore's master key to happiness. And we shall see as his diary proceeds that few mortals have ever been so largely blest with this 'sunshine of the breast.' When it is considered how indissolubly men usually connect the possession of wealth with the enjoyment of existence — how we Britons 'toil and moil' to acquire it, and what sacrifices we make to escape from comparative poverty — the spectacle of a man 'without a shilling to call 'his own,' flourishing in all the pride of aristocratical friendships and culling the choicest pleasures which life affords, really becomes an irritating subject of contemplation. It may be doubted

whether, at any one period of his life, Moore knew what it was to be solvent; yet he slept tranquilly, in the persuasion that he carried in his nightcap a talisman, an Aladdin's lamp, which he had only to rub to become rich; at least rich enough for his and 'Bessy's' moderate wants. Nay, more, as he mounts to his garret in Bury Street, farthing candle in hand, he can dwell on the recollection of having half an hour before shone a 'star of 'the first water' in the bright firmament of Almack's, and formed the subject of rivalry between ladies of rank, beauty, and fashion, to obtain the privilege of possessing him as their guest.

We turn now to the reverse of the picture — hard literary labour.

The 'Life of Sheridan' consumed the greater portion of the author's working time from 1822 to 1825, costing him a world of pains, and not a few disagreeable and tiresome researches. Embarrassing doubts as to the colouring proper to be given to certain passages, and honest disgust at the generally discreditable cast of the character he had to portray, were frequently present with the biographer, who obviously felt his task oppressive. Here is an entry of Sept. 1818: — 'In the garden all day — 'delicious weather — at my Sheridan task from ten till three. '. . . I often wish Sheridan, Miss Linley, and Matthews 'at the devil. This would have been a day for poetry, and yet 'thus have I lost all this most poetical summer.' (Vol. ii. p. 173.)

Another entry at this period is worth quoting, as an example of Moore's power of giving himself up to present feeling, regardless of harassing contingencies: — 'One day so like another, 'that there is little by which to distinguish their features; and 'these are the happiest; true cottage days, tranquil and indus-'trious. . . . Pursued my task all day in the garden,' &c.

The amusing *jeu d'esprit* which his trip to Paris gave rise to, 'The Fudge Family,' and which had considerable vogue, furnished a welcome addition to 'the supplies.' By way of keeping them up, too, he excogitated another *piquant*, though not perhaps very felicitous satire, 'Tom Cribb's Memorial,' of which Moore himself felt not, we suspect, particularly proud. There is in the 'Diary' the following sentence: — 'Went on 'with the slang epistle. It seems profanation to write such 'buffoonery in the midst of this glorious sunshine; but, alas! 'money must be had; and these trifles bring it soonest and 'easiest.' (Vol. ii. p. 218.)

The Bermuda matter wearing a serious aspect towards the middle of the following year (1819), Moore judged it prudent to

take steps for avoiding legal pursuit. He had some idea of betaking himself to Holyrood House, in expectation of which Sir James Mackintosh writes to him thus: — 'You will find in 'Edinburgh as many friends and admirers as even *you* could 'find anywhere.' But the prospect of going to the Continent, in company with his friend Lord John Russell, came between, and decided him upon passing a few months abroad; the rather as Lord and Lady Lansdowne were contemplating an excursion to Paris, and Moore expected to meet them in that city.

All this came duly to pass: moreover Lord John and Moore travelled on together across the Alps, as far as Milan, where the friends took leave of each other, not without regret. Moore, full of curiosity to see more of Italy, sets off alone, in a crazy vehicle bought at Milan for the journey, and first wends his way, by Brescia, Padua, &c., to the spot where Lord Byron was at this time residing, near Fusina. We hardly call to mind any autobiography which more entirely reflects the thoughts, feelings, and foibles of the writer than the journal of Moore's Italian tour, so that one seems to follow him about with a thoroughly familiar companionship, owing to the rare fidelity and candour with which he records both his proceedings and reflections.

What, indeed, can be more lifelike than the details of the few days he spends at Venice, comprehending many hours passed in the company of Lord Byron? We here see these two creative geniuses *en dèshabille*, and are enabled to add one more to the evidences we already possess, how completely the imaginative faculty can be cast aside, and the gross reality of human nature suffered to predominate, in the persons of great poets; as, indeed, with great orators, painters, great musical composers, and the like. It would seem that splendid gifts are commonly associated with a lively appetite and capacity for enjoyment, and that the whole being, ardently constituted in every respect, *must* expend its various forces in turn, in order to maintain its balance of powers.*

The noble Bard at least was aroused from all *his* sentimental musings by the arrival of 'Anacreon'; and this to so great a degree as to destroy all the pleasure of the latter in approaching Venice: Lord Byron's rattling ludicrous talk utterly putting to

* The names of Raphael, Michael Angelo, Benvenuto Cellini, Alfieri, Sheridan, Mozart, Charles James Fox, Rossini, Mirabeau, Porson, Burns, &c., may in some sort serve to sustain this hypothesis.

flight the whole illusion and poetic charm of Moore's first gondola voyage. (Vol. iii. p. 24.)

Five days of delightful racketing ensued: Lord Byron, although he had other attractions in his house at La Mira, insisted on Moore's taking up his quarters at his palazzo in Venice, coming in occasionally himself to enjoy his friend's company. They dine together at the 'Pellegrino' more than once, go to the theatre, and afterwards adjourn to a sort of public house, 'to drink hot punch; forming a strange contrast 'to a dirty cobbler whom we saw in a nice room delicately 'eating ice. Lord B. took me home in his gondola at two 'o'clock: a beautiful moonlight, and the stillness and grandeur 'of the whole scene, gave a nobler idea of Venice than I had 'yet had.' (Vol. iii. p. 28.)

On leaving Venice, Moore travelled, *viâ* Bologna, to Florence, where he worked hard at sight-seeing; but, as everywhere else, diversifying those duties by theatres and society. Lady Morgan at this period was in the ascendant; and through her and Lady Burghersh, Moore met all who were worth seeing in Florence. His susceptibility to sublime emotions is thus unaffectedly manifested after a visit to the church of the Annunziata: — 'Whether it be my Popish blood or my poetical feelings, 'nothing gives me more delight than the "pomp and circum-'"stance" of a mass in so grand a church; accompanied by fine 'music, and surrounded by such statuary and such paintings, it 'is a most elevating spectacle.'

And now the traveller reaches Rome, the ever longed for goal of all sentimental pilgrims. Here Lady Davy, who, with the Duchess of Devonshire, appears to have shared the privilege of 'lionizing' distinguished English visitors about the Eternal City, 'undertakes' Moore, whilst Mr. Canning falls to the care of her Grace.

He makes a brief halt at Florence, where he is forced to consent to sit to Bartolini for his bust, partly at the instance of Chantrey, who wants to make one also, and to 'let Moore see 'the difference.' Whilst here, Lady Burghersh communicated to him some particulars respecting the Empress Maria Louisa, with whom she had frequent opportunities of intercourse, passing some time with her at her principality. Maria Louisa, it seems, 'loved Napoleon at first; but his *rébutant* manner to her 'disgusted her at last. Treated her like a mere child; her 'regency a mere sham; did not know what the papers were she 'had to sign; never had either message or line from Napoleon 'after his first abdication, nor until his return from Elba . . .; 'Never hears from him at St. Helena,' &c. (Vol. iii. p. 79.)

Moore arrives once more in Paris about the close of the year (1820); and, after a month or two, spent *en garçon*, is there joined by his wife and family, occupying a kind of 'rus in urbe' in a suburb of Paris, called then 'l'Allée des Veuves.' During the period which elapsed between their establishing themselves here and the autumn of the following year (rather more than eighteen months), Moore divided his life between Paris delights and literary composition; but candour compels us to own that the portion devoted to amusement formed by far the larger one.

The Paris episode, however, after all that can be urged, leaves a grave feeling of regret that Moore was ever drawn into so mischievous a vortex; though there were occasions when his time was more worthily and profitably invested. His acquaintance with Denon led to some not infructuous studies; whilst the arrival in Paris of his friends Lord and Lady Holland, around whom a certain intellectual atmosphere always gathered, seems to have strung up the Poet's mind to a healthier tone for a season, as the altered character of the 'entries' in the Diary amply attests.

It is refreshing, too, amidst the whirl of daily dissipation, to find how tenderly he and Mrs. Moore continue attached to each other: — '25th March, 1821. This day ten years we were 'married, and though time has made his usual changes in us 'both, we are still more like lovers than any married couples of 'the same standing I am acquainted with. Asked to dine at 'Rancliffe's, but dined at home alone with Bessy, &c.'

Still, if justice were duly done upon mortal sinners, Moore ought to have been sentenced, on his return to England, to a six months' sojourn in Baker Street or Torrington Square; without ever going to the play, and being only allowed to dine abroad once a month. At the end of such a probation (supposing him to have survived its rigours), the offender might have come out of it, if somewhat less fascinating and agreeable than before, more nearly resembling what, under the meridian of Greenwich at least, it is conceived a man blessed with a wife and children ought to be. But it is far from certain that he would have been permitted to preserve this reformed character by his numerous soliciting friends.

The Bermuda defalcation having been made up, as has been already said, partly through the friendly aid of Lord John Russell (Messrs. Longman advancing the larger portion by way of loan), the Poet and his little family leave Paris and once more 'set up their rest' (if this phrase may be employed in connexion with so unquiet a spirit as his) at Sloperton Cottage. Shortly

afterwards the 'Loves of the Angels' came forth, for which we find the author receiving 700*l.*, and next the 'Fables of the Holy 'Alliance,' so that we can scarcely accuse him of not working diligently at this time. Two visits to London, of a month each, succeed; during which his life was one incessant course of dining out, going to operas and plays, parties, balls, breakfasts, and so forth. His social reputation was now at its zenith, and the fashionable world opened its doors to him as to a privileged being. A delightful tour to Killarney, Cork, and other places in Ireland, in company with his noble friends of Bowood, enlivened the summer, and by the help of a subsequent visit to Mr. Benett, at Pyt-house, and the amusing sale of Mr. Beckford's effects at Fonthill, he managed to get through what remained of the year 1823, in his cottage home, contentedly enough.

Sheridan's Life was the task on which, as we have stated above, Moore habitually and earnestly occupied himself; that is to say, when 'Phipps' did not happen to 'call in his gig;' a form of seduction which, coupled with the vision of a dinner at the inn at Devizes in the background, rarely failed of its effect. It is beside the purpose of this article to enter upon a critical notice of Moore's writings; yet it is impossible to allude to this particular work without observing that in it he is justly chargeable with mistatement on more than one point. A desire to drape the memory of his subject (we must not term him his 'hero') with a certain plausible interest, has led him to cast unmerited censure upon many who had once stood in friendly relationship to Sheridan. It is now pretty generally understood that the estrangement which latterly subsisted between the Whig party and Sheridan was altogether his own work. After having by adroit management withdrawn a sum of 4000*l.* out of the hands of the party in whose keeping it was deposited by the Prince Regent, pending its application to the procuring a seat in Parliament for Sheridan — he appears to have felt it impossible to face his old associates; at least he ever after avoided the society of the eminent men of the Liberal party. It never could be said that they neglected him; they knew nothing, except that he kept aloof from them; but they were far from deaf to the cry of perishing decay when at length Sheridan permitted it to reach their ear.* The misplaced sarcasms, again, with which Moore seasons his dramatic detail of Sheridan's closing days — sarcasms

* Both the Duke of Bedford and Mr. Canning, Moore afterwards affirms (in his 'Diary'), sent to Sheridan considerable sums within a year of his death.

levelled at certain noble persons who did violence to their feelings in attending his funeral rather than give pain to his widow — though partially retracted in his preface to the fifth edition, must be regarded as a poor device, resorted to by way of turning the reader's attention from the character of the man, and fastening it upon the condition to which he was reduced by the imputed inconstancy of his 'great' friends.

There have been, perhaps, few examples of so prodigious an abuse of the disposition in human nature to tolerate vices and defective moral feeling, in behalf of brilliant talents, as Sheridan's character and conduct furnished. That there should be a limit, beyond which an admiring sympathy could not secure even him against disapprobation and contempt, ought to be subject for gratulation, not for querulous complaint. But a biographer, like a barrister, feels bound, we presume, to present the best case he can for his client; and this must be Moore's apology.* The statement concerning the Prince's indifference was not less unfounded; for it has been satisfactorily shown that George the Fourth entertained, for this pitiable wreck of a once cherished associate, sentiments more kindly than his conduct deserved; and further, that he would gladly have mitigated by his bounty the sufferings he compassionated.

The book we are speaking of, with all its faults, had also great merits, and was (like everything Moore wrote, indeed) eagerly welcomed on its appearance in the autumn of 1825.

The first edition sold rapidly, and Moore felt himself relieved of a load of obligation, for the publishers were generous enough to superadd the sum of 300*l.* to the original price of the copyright, in consequence of the extensive sale which it met with at the very outset. A tribute of admiration from Lord John Russell, on reading it, is thus couched: —

'I am all astonishment at the extent of your knowledge, the soundness of your political views, and the skill with which you contrive to keep clear of tiresomeness, when the subject seems to invite it. . . .

'I dined at Wimbledon yesterday, and all the Spensers sang chorus in praise of your book.' (Vol. iv. p. 323.)

When we run our eye over the entries in Moore's Diary, we are apt to take comparatively little heed of those which relate

* In confirmation of this view of the matter, we may quote a passage from a book recently published: — 'On my complimenting 'Moore,' says Sir Robert Heron, 'on his impartiality in the "Life '"of Sheridan," he told me he regretted having suppressed many 'facts, and represented his character much too favourably.' (*Notes*, 2nd ed. 1851, p. 254.)

purely to work. Yet they really are numerous, though a fortnight is commonly included in a line; such as '3rd to 17th. At 'work;' 'Rest of this month hard at work.' Hence we are unconsciously led to regard the labour as nothing in the scale, when weighed against the indulgence of the gregarious propensity. The 'Diary,' in fact, taken in its general character, might bear to be prefaced by an inscription which we remember to have read upon a sun-dial near Padua, 'Horas non numero nisi 'serenas.'

As a holiday, after being so hard at work, was indispensable, Moore rushes off to Scotland, and pays a visit to Sir Walter Scott at Abbotsford, a brief account of which is among the pleasantest passages in the book. Scott's conversation about his own productions is curious, showing that he rather stumbled upon his talent than cultivated it originally. 'Had begun 'Waverley long before, and then thrown it by, until having occa-'sion for some money (to help his brother, I think), he bethought 'himself of it, but could not find the MSS.' (Vol. iv. p. 333.) When he *did*, 'made 3000*l.* by Waverley.'

Moore goes to the theatre (need we say?) at Edinburgh, of which his brother-in-law, Murray, was manager. Jeffrey, Sir Walter, and Mr. Thomson are there with him. The enthusiasm displayed by the audience is quite extravagant (for us Scotchmen), and delights Sir Walter, who exclaims, 'This is 'quite right. I am glad my countrymen have returned the 'compliment for me.'

Moore also visits Mr. Jeffrey at Craigcrook. On the morrow of his arrival, he writes: —

'After breakfast, sitting with Jeffrey in his beautiful little Gothic study, he told me at much length his opinion of my "Life of Sheridan." Thinks it a work of great importance to my fame. . . . . "Here," (said Jeffrey) "is a convincing proof that you can think and reason "solidly and manfully, and treat the gravest and most important sub-"jects in a manner worthy of them. . . . . I am of opinion that you 'have given us the only clear, fair, and manly account of the public 'transactions of the last fifty years, that we possess."' (Vol. v. p. 7.)

On his return from Scotland, Moore is called to Dublin by the illness of his father, who expires shortly subsequent to his son's arrival. Through the kindness of Messrs. Longman, who, although Moore is so heavily in debt towards the firm, permit him to draw upon them, he discharges all outstanding obligations, defrays expenses of his father's funeral, and supports his mother with all the comforts and attentions the occasion calls for. The Lord Lieutenant proposes to arrange that the half pay enjoyed by the late Mr. Moore should be continued, under the form of

pension, to his daughter. Moore peremptorily declines the offer.

'All this is very kind and liberal of Lord Wellesley; and God knows how useful such an aid would be, as God alone knows how I am to support all the burthens now heaped upon me; but I *could not* accept such a favour.' (Vol. v. p. 25.)

It would seem that during the year 1826, Moore's talent for facetious and satirical verse-making was placed at the service of 'The Times' newspaper, and, as has ever been the practice with that Journal, was amply remunerated. In fact, looking on the one hand at the large sums realised by every thing he produced, and on the other at the very modest scale on which his *ménage* was conducted, together with the well-attested frugality and self-denial of his excellent partner, we have found it difficult to explain the state of chronic insolvency in which Moore obviously lived. His children were, it is true, always ailing, his wife never well. But then their medical attendant, Dr. Brabant of Devizes, having a cordial sympathy for genius and virtue in difficulties, would accept no fees. Moore himself seems to have had no expensive habits, except that he never refused himself a hack post-chaise; that luxury which Dr. Johnson so feelingly prized! His 'junkettings' in London were usually enjoyed at the cost of others, and his garret to sleep in seems to have constituted almost his only expense. The solution must lie in the fact of his having twice had to overtake a considerable sum by his unassisted exertions, his own maintenance and that of his parents needing to be provided at the same time.

The history of the gift, sale, and ultimate destruction of Lord Byron's 'Memoirs' has been so much canvassed, and versions so various have circulated concerning Moore's conduct on the occasion, that we are thankful to find much circumstantial information to guide us to a safe conclusion, though the 'Diary' contains only a part of what Moore left in elucidation of this complex affair. The rest has been withheld by the noble Editor, and we are bound to say without, as far as we can discover, satisfactory reasons for its suppression. Enough nevertheless remains wherewith to frame an accurate summary of this case,—an indispensable item in a retrospective sketch of the Poet's life.

The 'Memoirs' were given to him, without reserve, as without directions, by Lord Byron; but were unquestionably intended partly as a justification of himself, and partly as a means of enriching his friend. Moore, pressed for money (as

usual), made over the MSS. to Mr. Murray for the sum of 2000 guineas. He subsequently intended to modify the transaction by a clause to be inserted in the deed, by which he, Moore, should have the option of redeeming the 'Memoirs' within three months after Lord Byron's death, and he was fully impressed with the belief that the agreement had been altered according to his intention.

When the unlooked-for event of Lord Byron's death occurred, in 1824, the family and personal friends of the deceased nobleman urgently sought to possess themselves of the manuscript, with a view to its destruction. Moore, conceiving that in yielding it up for that purpose he should be defeating the intentions and wishes of his friend, demurs to the request. He pleads earnestly for its publication, proposing to suppress all matter calculated either to wound the feelings of living persons, or to shock public taste. But the Byron family, Mrs. Leigh, Sir John Hobhouse, and Mr. Wilmot Horton, are inexorable; and so much importunity is addressed both to Moore and Mr. Murray, by various distinguished parties, that they at length consent to place the 'Memoirs' in the hands of Mr. Wilmot Horton and Colonel Doyle, as the representatives of Mrs. Leigh; who forthwith commit the same to the flames at Mr. Murray's house.

Mr. Murray, of course, stipulates to be repaid his money with lawful interest, which is accordingly done, by a draft drawn by Moore on Mr. Rogers.* (Vol. v. p. 224.) Much persuasion is used to induce Moore to accept of compensation at the hands of the Byron family — even his most valued friends, such as Lord and Lady Lansdowne, Mr. Luttrell, Lord John Russell, with Mr. Rogers and his sister, concur in the opinion that he ought to do so. Moore's high sense of self-respect is, however, a match for all, and he steadily refuses. Indeed, for some time after the destruction of the 'Memoirs,' his mind is uneasy, lest he should have committed an act of constructive disloyalty towards his departed friend and benefactor. Ultimately he learns from Sir John Hobhouse that Lord Byron, when remonstrated with by himself as to the indiscretion of placing such a MS. out of his own control, had replied, 'that he re-'gretted having done so, and that delicacy towards Moore 'alone deterred him from reclaiming it;' on this Moore is reassured, and whilst regretting the loss to the world, rests

* This loan, or accommodation, on the part of Mr. Rogers, was subsequently repaid out of the profits of 'The Loves of the Angels' and 'Fables of the Holy Alliance.' (See Preface to vol. viii. of 'Works.')

satisfied with the course which he had himself pursued. It has been objected, that at the time Moore made this reluctant cession, the 'Memoirs' were, strictly speaking, the property of Mr. Murray, and that Moore had consequently no claim to merit in making the sacrifice; the rather, as he foresaw that a round sum might hereafter be gained by his becoming Lord Byron's biographer, on a new footing. The truth is that, by his own oversight, the clause providing for the redemption of the MS. by Moore was *not* inserted in the deed, and thus the property remained with the Bookseller. But nobody was cognisant of this fact till after the deed was virtually cancelled by the destruction of the 'Memoirs;' so that Moore's proceeding is entitled to whatever credit may be thought to attach to his resigning his share in them. At the same time, Mr. Murray must be held to have acted with perfect good faith, and with liberality, as well as with strictly business-like correctness, throughout the affair.*

The following extracts will afford a sample of the familiar conversation of Bowood, where Moore was now continually a guest:—

'1824. Oct. 23rd. Dined at Bowood: company, Grosetts and Clutterbucks, Mrs. Clutterbuck looking very pretty. Clutterbuck's story of the old lady (his aunt) excellent. Being very nervous, she told Sir W. Farquhar she thought Bath would do her good. "It's "very odd," says Sir W., "but that's the very thing I was going to "recommend to you. I will write the particulars of your case to a "very clever man there, in whose hands you will be well taken care "of." The lady, furnished with the letter, sets off, and on arriving at Newbury, feeling, as usual, very nervous, she said to her confidant, "Long as Sir Walter has attended me, he has never explained to me "what ails me. I have a great mind to open his letter and see what "he has stated of my case to the Bath physician." In vain her friend represented to her the breach of confidence this would be. She opened the letter, and read, "Dear Davis, keep the old lady three "weeks, and send her back again."'

---

* There must have been some mistake as to the information alleged by Davison, the printer, to have been received by him from Mr. Bland, Lady Byron's solicitor, to the effect that 'she was highly pleased with 'Moore's Life of Lord Byron.' This circumstance was mentioned to Moore by Mr. Murray, on February 2. 1830. (Diary, vol. vi. p. 104.) We have reason to know, from the best authority, that Lady Byron never had a solicitor named Bland, and that she never expressed an opinion conveying, directly or indirectly, an approval of Moore's work. Lady Byron declined, in 1825, to furnish materials for it, when Moore applied to her, for letters and papers concerning Lord Byron, through their common friend, Sir Francis Doyle.

'1825. Jan. 3rd. Walked over to Bowood: company, Mackintosh and his daughter, Mr. and Mrs. Vernon Smith and Lewson Smith. . . . . A good deal of conversation about Burke in the evening. Mentioned his Address to the British colonists in North America. "Armed as you are, we embrace you as our friends and "as our brothers, by the best and dearest ties of relation." The tone of the other parts, however, is, I find, moderate enough. Burke was of opinion that Hume, if he had been alive, would have taken the side of the French Revolution. Dugald Stewart thinks the same. The grand part of Burke's life was between 1772 and the end of the American war; afterwards presumed upon his fame and let his imagination run away with him. Lord Charlemont said that Burke was a Whig upon Tory principles. Fox said it was lucky that Burke and Windham took the side against the French Revolution, as they would have got hanged on the other. Windham's speech on Curwen's motion for Reform — an ingenious defence of parliamentary corruption — like the pleading of a sophist. Burke gave the substance of the India Bill, and Pigot drew it up.'

'1833. Feb. 6th. An excellent *mot* of somebody to Fontenelle, on the latter saying that he flattered himself he had a good heart, — "Yes, my dear Fontenelle, you have as good a heart as can be made "out of brains."'

'In talking with Hallam afterwards, I put it to him why it was that this short way of expressing truths did not do with the world, often as it had been tried, even Rochefoucauld being kept alive chiefly by his ill-nature? There was in this one saying to Fontenelle all that I myself had expended many pages on in my "Life of Byron," endeavouring to bring it out clearly; namely, the great difference there is between that sort of sensibility which is lighted up in the heads and imagination of men of genius, and the genuine natural *sensibility* whose seat is in the heart. Even now, in thus explaining my meaning, how many superfluous words have I made use of? Talking of the Brahmins being such good chess-players (nobody, it seems, can stand before them at the game), Mrs. Hasting's *naïveté* was mentioned, in saying, "Well, people talk a good deal about the "Brahmins playing well, but I assure you Mr. Hastings, who is very "fond of chess, constantly plays those who come to the Government "House, and always beats them."'

For three editions of the 'Epicurean' (which first came out in 1827) Messrs. Longman, we find, credited the author 700*l.* In 1828 Mr. Murray finally concludes a bargain with him to write a 'Life of Byron,' for which he is to receive 4000 guineas. Moore begins this in February, after having paid a visit to Newstead Abbey, and to Colwich, the residence of Mrs. Musters (formerly Miss Chaworth), with whom he conversed respecting Byron, as he has related in the 'Life.' The usual gaddings, excursions, and pleasure-hunting characterise these years, the record of which is, however, interspersed with

amusing notes of conversations, held chiefly at Holland House and Bowood; often valuable, though brief, from the light they shed upon transactions regarding which public channels of information have been of necessity imperfect ones. Many little touches reveal the state of political parties, too, in a way no out-of-doors organ could possibly do. The ill-assorted combinations of 1826–27–28, which succeeded on the break-up of Tory ascendancy, are curiously commented upon; and some good stories also find a place in the 'Diary.'

The sixth volume opens with 1829, and the death of his amiable daughter, Anastasia, which plunged both her fond parents into deep affliction. The 'Notices of the Life of 'Byron' came out in the following year, after which Moore set to work to collect materials for that of Lord Edward Fitzgerald; in fact, he seems to have been more than commonly industrious about this time. He and his wife made a journey to Ireland in August, mainly on this errand, but also to visit Moore's mother once more. At a great meeting of from two to three thousand people, Moore being induced to make a speech, on the subject of the late French revolution of 'the three days' (Bessy being among the auditors), it proved one of the happiest efforts in oratory that he ever essayed.

'From this on to the end my display was most successful, and the consciousness that every word *told* on my auditory, reacted upon me with a degree of excitement which made me feel capable of *anything*. The shouts, the applause, the waving of hats, &c., after I had finished, lasted for some minutes. I heard Sheil, too, as I concluded, say with much warmth, "he is a most beautiful speaker!"' (Vol. vi. p. 140.)

The enthusiasm felt for Moore by his countrymen is, indeed, universal, and proclaimed; and many of his admirers endeavour to persuade him to try for a seat in Parliament for some Irish constituency. This temptation, which is renewed after return to Sloperton, he steadily resists (although his inclination would have strongly urged him to accept the offer), on the ground of his utter want of fortune.

Of 'adventures' there are, properly speaking, none in the whole six volumes; Moore's movements being chiefly from Devizes to Bath, from Bath to Farley, from Farley to Laycock, from Laycock to Bowood, and so on, — much after the style of Major Sturgeon's campaigns. But although his person revolved in a limited orbit, his mental activity, and frequent unreserved commerce with the class in whose hands the government of the nation was now vested, caused him to feel no want of more enlarged experience of the world. The privilege enjoyed by

Moore, of going frequently to Bowood, was fully appreciated by him. No one had a more sincere or cordial admiration for the character of its noble owner; a long and intimate acquaintance with which enabled Moore to comprehend and estimate it at its true value.

Moore's political feelings partook all through life of the early impressions derived from his boyish connexion with certain friends who were forward in the organisation of Irish resistance to the Government in 1795-96. Though a mere youth, his ardent attachment to Ireland led him to yield the fullest sympathy to those efforts, and from that period downwards he never spoke or wrote about his native country save in a strain of mournful resentment. He was himself, whilst a college student, subjected to an examination before the formidable Chancellor Fitzgibbon, and displayed a self-possession, and we might even say an heroic fidelity to his associates, highly praiseworthy in one so young. The scene is related in the first vol. of the present publication, and had been previously described by Moore in the preface to his 'Works' in ten vols. 1840. His 'Letters of Captain Rock' likewise display his views and feelings on Irish politics. But although he held opinions of a strongly democratic cast, he seems to have been less cordial in his wishes for reform in Parliament in 1831-32 than might have been expected. This is to be ascribed partly, as he confesses, to his having reached the age of fifty before the Reform movement became effectual, and partly to his comparatively slender interest in English politics, with which he rarely meddled, whilst with Irish affairs he maintained a constant sympathy. (See his Letter to Electors of Limerick, vol. iv. p. 305.) The 'wrongs of Ireland' lay at the bottom of his heart, and tinged his views on most public questions. It is honourable both to himself and his noble associates, that Moore's extreme opinions, though openly maintained and ably defended, never interrupted the friendly relations in which he lived with the leading statesmen of the Liberal party. His outspoken objections to the course pursued by the Whig Government, after 1831, towards Ireland, would infallibly have offended any minister but the nobleman who, for Moore's incalculable good fortune, bore him a friendship so warm as to be proof against the shocks of dissent when coming from his privileged neighbour.

A recent newspaper criticism has laboured to fasten upon Moore the imputation of having 'dangled upon the great;'—one more groundless could scarcely be adduced—'the great' ran after Moore, not he after the great. If there be one fact more abundantly attested than another by the 'Diary,' it is

this. And among the rare instincts which his nature revealed was the perception of that nice medium between familiarity and humility of demeanour, which he so admirably hit in his intercourse with the nobility of both sexes. He was treated like a spoiled child; yet he conducted himself like a well-bred man. He might assuredly feel a pride in reflecting that he could reckon among his intimate friends the names of Walter Scott, Samuel Rogers, Crabbe, Bowles, Sydney Smith, Lord Byron, Francis Jeffrey, Lord Holland, Luttrell, Lord John Russell, Lord and Lady Lansdowne, with those of other eminent and estimable persons of both sexes; and he did feel it. But no one, we venture to affirm, could charge Moore with presuming upon the favour with which they regarded him. What he seems to be most severely reproached with is, having been inwardly elated, flattered, — made happy, in short, by it. On this manner of construing the revelations comprised in these volumes, we will, even at the risk of appearing tedious, venture to offer some remarks.

The general reader of Memoirs seems to require, before all things, the gratification of his curiosity. But one would think that, this primary object being attained, the next would be to acquire an accurate knowledge of the inward mind and thoughts of the author, particularly if he be a person of eminent and renowned character; and so it is, for every body takes pleasure in diving into the soul of genius, and prying into the laboratory of a poet's fancy. If, however, the writer record for posthumous publication feelings which he would or ought to have dissembled during life, such is the inveterate, the all-puissant influence of conventional habits, that, instead of thanking him for his candour and veracity, the public positively blame him for not disguising his genuine emotions, for not counterfeiting to posterity indifference both to high reputation and to homage from his fellow-creatures. The very quality which is understood to bestow a value on autobiography, — viz. the presenting the writer's real mind and thoughts to the reader, — is lost sight of in the abhorrence which the public entertain for what they term 'ridiculous personal 'vanity!' They shrink from every thing which is not disguised and 'dressed up' in a decorous garb, covering all personal defects. The public have, indeed, so long and so peremptorily prohibited all external signs of self-satisfaction, or self-love, that at length they have come to believe in the Latin apophthegm, that what does not appear, does not exist; and thus, when the weaknesses of an idol are disclosed, through his private closet avowals, they regard him as a rare instance of depraved

morals, and fall to abusing him as such. For in our artificial society, every thing is made to give way to conventional forms and usages, and neither mind nor matter dare wander beyond the prescribed despotic circle.

To be sure, if a writer of autobiography has died in want and misery, if his vanity has been never so misplaced, offensive, or egregious, we can afford to be more indulgent; the mortification and humiliation he has endured have the effect of neutralising the ascetic element within us, and we feel comforted, as it were, by the spectacle of expiatory justice. But let not the successful or happy man lift the veil, and reveal the pleasure with which a life of labour and poverty was sweetened when he was praised, flattered, and loved by his contemporaries. In vain would his apologists plead that vanity, under profuse homage, is at once natural and innocuous. His prosperity renders it necessary that he should endure the nemesis of the community, and expiate the sin of success.

A great deal has been said, also, respecting Moore's neglect of his domestic hearth; so much, indeed, that it would be unbecoming, in presenting even this slender portraiture of the man, to pass over such a statement in silence. He certainly enjoyed mingling with his friends and acquaintance when his work was done — sometimes, indeed, when it was not done — and it is not disguised in the pages before us that Mrs. Moore felt his frequent absences from home. On the other hand, it should be borne in mind that, whereas mental labour, especially that of the inventive faculty, exhausts the individual more than any other occupation, so it is of the last importance to him to seek occasional, even frequent, renovation by some external agency. The spirit-stirring action of pleasant and distinguished society, the expansion of his peculiarly happy talent for conversation, the exercise of his almost magical gift of touching the feelings by musical expression* — all these recreated the man, and replenished the springs of those powers by means of which the poor poet was to produce his page on the morrow. The physician, the lawyer, the minister, the sharebroker, the soldier, and others, necessarily pass their lives *from* home, a return to which constitutes a welcome change and relief. But the labo-

* No person was ever gifted with a more perfect organisation for music than the deceased Irish Bard. Had he received a thoroughly sound musical education, it is difficult to say whether he might not have produced some great composition as gorgeous in melody and harmony as the Eastern Imagery of his 'Lalla Rookh.' — Ella, *Musical Sketches*, 1853.

rious man of letters spends his working hours alone, in silence, within his own four walls; when the sand of his intellectual hour-glass has run out, he needs variety, and the reviving influences afforded by social and festive pleasures. If the Irish temperament happen to be superadded, the want is, by so much, intensified. Again, the strongest endeavours were used to prevail on Mrs. Moore to accompany her husband into the world; to Bowood especially, the house at which he was the most frequently himself a guest, Moore often strove to persuade her to accept Lord and Lady Lansdowne's many cordial invitations, but to little purpose. We cannot wonder at this. Mrs. Moore wanted the inclination to mix in the society of persons with whom she had no familiar acquaintance, and she was too proud (Moore says) to be at her ease with such as she knew and felt to be her superiors in birth and education, though not in personal beauty or native talent. Farther, she could afford neither fine clothes nor carriage; she was the habitual nurse-mother to sickly children, whilst her own health gave her but too frequent cause for avoiding social engagements. Thus Moore must have gone into company without her or stayed by her side; an alternative which, as a rule of conduct, both he and Mrs. Moore knew and felt to be far from advantageous to either, however glad he might feel to fly back to it when the needful stimulus was over. Moore might be said to belong to a numerous 'proprietary,' among whom his wife unquestionably held the greatest number of 'shares.' But Mrs. Moore had far too much sense and feeling to wish or expect to monopolise all the leisure hours of so gifted, so mercurial a being. She was, nevertheless, throughout life, the sole object of his tender, admiring affection, as well as of his grateful esteem. She alone possessed his heart, though others shared in his society. It may be added that Mrs. Moore's ambition for her husband was gratified by the homage paid to him by the world, and that she enjoyed his social successes, though she declined to share them.

Moore, as we have seen, lived in the most agreeable and refined society of his day in London: his Diary contains few original comments on passing political events, or on the characters of persons with whom he is brought in contact; but he registers many of the most amusing anecdotes, jokes, repartees, and remarks on various subjects, which he has heard in conversation. Hence he has preserved not only many of the anonymous witticisms of the day, but many excellent sayings of Sydney Smith, Luttrell, Rogers, Robert Smith, Jekyll, and others, which might otherwise have remained unrecorded. It would be easy to make a large selection of such passages. The

following, chosen from the last two volumes, may serve as specimens: —

'As an instance of confusion between history and romance, he (Lord Lansdowne) mentioned some old lady, who used always to be talking of Sir Charles Grandison, having persuaded herself that she had known him and danced with him when a young girl.'

'Rogers mentioned a clever thing said by Lord Dudley, on some Vienna lady remarking impudently to him, "What wretchedly bad "French you all speak in London!" "It is true, Madame," he answered; "we have not enjoyed the advantage of having the French "twice in our capital!"'

'Mackintosh mentioned, as one of the happiest applications of a classic quotation that he knew anywhere, that of Leibnitz in his answer to Bayle's objections against Theism in his "Théodicée." Bayle had died before Leibnitz published this work; and, in speaking of this event, the latter said that it was but natural to suppose one of the rewards of his candid spirit, in its present state of bliss, would be the happiness of seeing all his former doubts on divine subjects cleared away: —

'Candidus *insuetum* miratur limen Olympi,
Sub pedibusque videt nubes et sidera.'

'Talked of the excessive stupidity of the Tories in their misrepresentation of what Plunkett said of their "turning history into an "old almanack," as if he had meant himself to assert that history was no more than an old almanack. There is, however, quite as much of Tory craft as of Tory stupidity in this wilful mistake.'

'In talking of O'Connell, of the mixture there is in him of high and low, formidable and contemptible, mighty and mean, [Bobus] Smith summed all by saying, "The only way to deal with such a "man is to hang him up and erect a statue to him under his gal-"lows."'

'Henry Bushe's account of his place to the Sinecure Committee, that he was "Resident Surveyor, with perpetual leave of absence!" "Don't you do any work for it?" "Nothing, but receive my salary "four times a year." "Do you receive that yourself?" "No, by "deputy."'

'Brougham mentioned to-day that, on the Princess of Wales' coming over to England, it was a matter of discussion among a party where Lady Charlotte Lindsay was, what *one* word of English her Royal Highness (who was totally ignorant of the language) should be first taught to speak. The whole company agreed that "yes" was the most useful word, except Lady Charlotte, who suggested that "no" was twice as useful, as it often stood for "yes," [whereas "yes" never stood for "no."] This story, Brougham said, he once made use of in Court, in commenting on the manner in which a witness had said "no."'

Moore, in a note to Sydney Smith, had alluded to his having

gone away from an evening party while he (Moore) was singing. This produced the following answer:—

'My Dear Moore,—By the beard of the Prelate of Canterbury, by the cassock of the Prelate of York, by the breakfasts of Rogers, by Luttrell's love of side-dishes, I swear that I had rather hear you sing than any person I ever heard in my life, male or female. For what is your singing but beautiful poetry floating in fine music, and guided by exquisite feeling? Call me Dissenter, say that my cassock is ill put on, that I know not the delicacies of decimation, and confound the greater and the smaller tithes; but do not think or say that I am insensible to your music. The truth is, that I took a solemn oath to Mrs. Beauclerk to be there by ten, and set off, to prevent perjury, at eleven; but was seized with a violent pain in the stomach by the way, and went to bed.

'Yours ever, my dear Moore, very sincerely,
'Sydney Smith.'

'Jekyll, in talking of figurative oratory, mentioned the barrister before Lord Ellenborough:—"My Lord, I appear before you in the "character of an advocate from the City of London. My Lord, the "City of London herself appears before you as a suppliant for justice. "My Lord, it is written in the Book of Nature,—"What book?" says Lord E. "The Book of Nature." "Name the page," says Lord E., holding his pen uplifted, as if to note the page down.'

'Talking of the small potentates of the Continent. The Prince de Reuss one of the first to acknowledge the French Republic. The terms of his recognition as follows:—"Le Prince de Reuss recon-"nâit la république Française." To which Talleyrand returned for answer, "La république Française est bien aise de faire connaissance "avec le Prince de Reuss.'

'Rogers's story of the young couple at Berlin in their opera-box, between whom, at a distance, there always appeared to be a person sitting, though, on going into their box, it was found that there was no one there but themselves. From all parts of the house this supernatural intruder could be seen, but people differed as to its appearance; some saying it was a fair man, others a dark; some maintaining that he was old, and others that he was young. It should be mentioned that there was some guilty mystery hanging over the connexion between these young people; and as, at last, no one ventured to visit their box, they disappeared from Berlin.'

'Lord Lansdowne remarked that though I had not [in the "Life "of Sheridan"] professedly drawn any parallel between the talents of Fox as a statesman, and those of Burke and Sheridan, yet he thought it might be deduced from my general sentiments, that I was not inclined to place Fox so far above the other two as he (Lord L.) thought he deserved. To this I answered, that neither had I in my book, nor would I venture now, to draw any parallel between Fox and Sheridan, with respect to political sagacity, but that I recollected Tierney once telling me that Pitt looked upon Sheridan as a much abler man than Fox. This surprised Lord Lansdowne.'

'Lord Holland told of Mr. Fox saying one night in the House, that his person had been frequently caricatured, but that he defied any one (and, in saying this, he placed his hands on his fat sides) to paint him in the character of Envy. . . . . In speaking of Burke he said, "You all overrate Burke; you, too, Master Moore, "among the number, particularly in saying that he ever could have "been trusted as leader of a great party." This I, of course, denied having said; the fact being, as well I can recollect, that I have maintained the direct contrary.'

'In talking of the vanity of great men, Denman said that Mr. Fox was an instance of a great man without a particle of vanity: Pitt, he believed also. In talking of Junius, was glad to find that Brougham considers this writer much overrated: said that he had declared this opinion once in the House of Commons . . . . . Brougham was by when Francis made the often-quoted answer to Rogers. "There is a question, Sir Philip," said R., "which I should much "like to ask, if you will allow me." "You had better not, sir," answered Francis, "you may have reason to be sorry for it (or "repent of it.") The addition to this story is, that Rogers, on leaving him, muttered to himself, "If he is Junius, it must be Junius "Brutus." Brougham himself asked him one day, "Is it a thing "quite ridiculous to suppose that you might be the Author?" "Why, "sir," he replied, "if the world is determined to make me out such "a ruffian, I can't help them." He never, Brougham thinks, actually denied the charge; but at all times, in this sort of angry way, evaded it. To Lady Holland, too, who tried him with the question, he answered, "Now that I am old, people think they may with im-"punity impute to me such rascality; but they durst not have done "so when I was young." Francis's vanity, it appears, led him to think that it was no great addition to his fame to have the credit of "Junius," having done, according to his own notion, much better things. This gets over one of the great difficulties in accounting for the concealment; and it must have been, at all events, either some very celebrated man who could dispense with such fame, or some very vain man who thought he could.'

The duties of editorship of the volumes hitherto published have been limited by Lord John Russell to the selection of letters and the preparation of the text of the Diary for the printer (after making a tolerably free, though perhaps too sparing use of the scissors), and the composing a friendly introduction to the first and sixth volumes. What additional value might have been imparted to the book by copious commentary and illustration, we will not inquire; since, if a man will have a Minister of the Crown, and nothing less, for his executor, it is not to be expected that his 'remains' should be so diligently prepared for publication as by an editor, whose entire time is at his command. If, indeed, Lord John had been able to devote many spare hours to the composition of

editorial notes, the Preface to the sixth volume shows how much the value of the work would have been enhanced by such additions. The few pages, indeed, of that short notice well deserve to be ranked among the most interesting in the book, containing, as they do, not only the apology for the innocent and unenvious vanity of Moore, but also some excellent sketches of character — sketches which vividly place the originals before the reader, and are suggested by the friendly recollection of pleasant hours passed in their company. The portraits of such distinguished men as Sir Walter Scott, Sir James Mackintosh, Sydney Smith, and Lord Holland, as they appeared in society, are graceful tributes of friendship and respect from one who had lived in their intimacy. They show that Lord John had well observed and noted in his earlier days the peculiar merits and qualities of men whom it was an honour to him to have known and appreciated, and to whose memory he now does honour in return by thus preserving their likeness. The generous and frank nature of Scott, superior to all literary jealousies and literary affectations, is well pourtrayed. We will, however, conclude our notice of this agreeable work by extracting from Lord John's preface the description of Sydney Smith's colloquial powers, which give as accurate an idea of them as can be conveyed by words: —

'If it is difficult to convey any notion of the conversation of Sir James Mackintosh, it is hardly possible to describe that of Sydney Smith. There are two kinds of colloquial wit which equally contribute to fame, though not equally to agreeable conversation. The one is like a rocket in a dark air which shoots at once into the sky, and is the more surprising from the previous silence and gloom; the other is like that kind of firework which blazes and bursts out in every direction, exploding at one moment and shining brightly at another, eccentric in its course, and changing its shape and colour to many forms and many hues. Or, as a dinner is set out with two kinds of champagne, so these two kinds of wit, the still and the sparkling, are to be found in good company. Sheridan and Talleyrand were among the best examples of the first; Hare (as I have heard) and Sydney Smith were brilliant instances of the second. Hare I knew only by tradition; but with Sydney Smith I long lived intimately. His great delight was to produce a succession of ludicrous images; these followed each other with a rapidity that scarcely left time to laugh; he himself laughing louder and with more enjoyment than any one. This electric contact of mirth came and went with the occasion; it cannot be repeated or reproduced. Anything would give occasion to it. His powers of fun were at the same time united with the strongest and most practical common sense. So that while he laughed away seriousness at one minute, he destroyed

in the next some rooted prejudice which had braved for a thousand years the battle of reason and the breeze of ridicule. The letters of Peter Plymley bear the greatest likeness to his conversation; the description of Mr. Isaac Hawkins Brown dancing at the Court of Naples in a volcano coat with lava buttons, and the comparison of Mr. Canning to a large blue-bottle fly with its parasites, most resemble the pictures he raised up in social conversation. 'It may be averred for certain, that in this style he has never been equalled, and I do not suppose he will ever be surpassed.'

---

Art. V. — *Report from the Select Committee on the National Gallery; together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 4th August [issued December], 1853.

Anticipating that the National Gallery would, ere long, attain an amount of public interest hitherto denied to it, we, a year ago, offered to our readers some account of the principal Art collections abroad; and, in tracing the progress of our own, we directed attention to various short-comings in its management, which have prevented a satisfactory development of what had at first been fairly inaugurated. The subject has since made very rapid advances, and it is now our intention to inquire how the Select Committee of the House of Commons, to whose recent appointment we could then merely refer, has discharged its duty of obtaining information, and under what circumstances it has arrived at conclusions in some respects opposed to those suggested by the mass of evidence reported by itself.

A word as to the origin and constitution of the Committee. The cleaning operations to which certain pictures had been subjected in the autumn of 1852, were denounced through the daily press in unmeasured terms; and, when Parliament met, notice of a motion for inquiry was early given by Mr. Francis Charteris, now Lord Elcho. But before it came on, he had accepted office in the new administration, and the conduct of the inquiry was undertaken in his stead by Colonel Mure. In order to include other Members, who had already taken part in analogous inquiries, the usual limit of Select Committees was extended, and seventeen gentlemen were named. Several Members of the Committee had distinguished themselves in the field of literature, and had more or less given a tone to public feeling in philosophy and poetry, in history and science, in antiquity and art. On the whole, we may admit that the selection was

well and judiciously made, and that it would have been difficult to bring together a body of accomplished gentlemen more worthy of public confidence. Should they have failed to earn it, the blame may fall rather on the nature of the tribunal than on its individual members. Indeed, no Committee of Parliament perhaps has grappled with a subject new to most of its members, and singularly involved in technicalities, in a spirit of more earnest investigation, or has more faithfully discharged the duty of hearing all sides with patience and impartiality. Nor were the difficulties light with which it had to contend, embracing, as these did, a vocabulary of terms by no means fixed in their signification, and the apprehension of means, appliances, and processes, as to which professional experts proved often at fault or at feud.

The Committee has certainly done its work in no perfunctory spirit. It sate thirty-five days, and, although several of its seventeen members served simultaneously on other committees, their daily average attendance was from ten to eleven. They examined sixty witnesses, fourteen of whom were called up more than once, besides obtaining written opinions or returns from many influential quarters and competent parties at home and abroad. Their Blue-book exceeds 1000 folio pages, and contains answers to 10,410 questions. The result is a mass of evidence, a body of assertions and opinions, such as has never before been brought together on matters of Art; its value and importance being limited only by the consideration, that many of its assertions are impugned, its opinions contradicted, either by the authors themselves, or by other witnesses of apparently equal weight. In almost every page facts cease to be stubborn things; and a glance at the Chairman's draft report (pp. xxv.—xxvii.), will satisfy any one of the obstacles which opposed any definite result to the investigation.*

In dealing with their subject, the Committee have divided it under four heads: 1. The Constitution and General Management of the Gallery; 2. Its Management as regards Picture-Cleaning; 3. Proposed Changes or Improvements of the System;

* We can here only refer to the mass of curious returns obtained from twelve foreign Galleries, in answer to a long and exhausting series of questions carefully prepared and circulated by Colonel Mure. It occupies a large space in the Appendix, and will prove of value for reference under any future management of our Museums. The country has incurred a debt of gratitude to Baron von Klenze, for much important information which he came purposely from Munich to communicate.

4. The most advisable site for the Gallery, and the Expediency of centralising some of the great National Collections. The bulky Blue-book before us may well suggest a doubt whether, on some of the various points thus brought under consideration, evidence has not been so accumulated as to overlay the inquiry. This seems especially the case as regards picture-cleaning; all mistakes committed in that way being obviously the result of some fault in the general management. Seeing that these mistakes were, to a certain degree, matters in dispute, and that they possessed additional importance as forming the basis of the whole inquiry, it was necessary that full opportunity should be afforded, both to impugners and defenders, of establishing their respective cases; and, further, that the public should learn from authority which of the two views was well-founded. But, by hearing a series of witnesses whose opinions differed in no important respects from those already recorded, including several volunteers of testimony on subjects which they had taken no pains to investigate, the Committee have clouded rather than cleared up the points which they were selected to solve; and thus, borne down by accumulated crudities and contradictions, have in the end shrunk from so marked a deliverance on the merits of the cause as was confidently looked for at their hands.

In the observations which we have to offer upon the Report and Evidence, we propose to follow a somewhat different order from that adopted by the Committee, and so reduce the picture-cleaning question to proportions consistent with the relative importance of other branches of the entire system. We shall accordingly arrange the subject as follows:—1. The Nature of the Management under which the affairs of the National Gallery have hitherto been administered; 2. The Results of that Management generally; 3. Its Effects upon the Preservation of the National Pictures; 4. Its Effects upon the Acquisition of Pictures; 5. The Remedies suggested or required; 6. The Questions of Site and Centralisation of Museums.

I. With respect to the existing management of the Gallery,—the evidence of Lord Aberdeen is peculiarly important, not only from his long-tried habits of business, but as, with one exception, the only original trustee now alive. From him we learn, that some time after the purchase of Mr. Angerstein's gallery, Lord Liverpool, then Premier, verbally appointed 'a 'few gentlemen' to look after it, without any official status or name, with no prescribed duties nor any responsibility, beyond seeing from time to time that the pictures were safely kept. Farther, that the Treasury passed no instructions or regulations whatever regarding the collection; and that he, though an

original trustee, knows of no authority by which it was vested in the Treasury, nor of the relations between the Treasury and Mr. W. Seguier, when named Keeper of the National Gallery. Lord Aberdeen distinctly avows that no system was inculcated on, or pursued by, the Trustees;—indeed, from there being so little for them to do, this was then of no consequence.* It is true that so anomalous a position of matters (which is amply confirmed by returns to Parliament), belonged to the infancy of the collection; but we have no indication from his Lordship that it has, in any material degree, been changed during the lapse of twenty-nine years, while the pictures have increased from 38 to about 400. And although we find witnesses referring loosely to regulations, nothing of the sort is found to exist beyond vague understanding on a few matters of usage. The six 'gentlemen' have gradually become seventeen, and have long been designated as 'Trustees.' For nearly four years at first, they seem never to have met at all; afterwards their Minutes bear one to four meetings annually; and it was only in 1840 that they resolved to assemble monthly during the sittings of Parliament. In this state of things, it is not surprising to find discrepancies of opinion between different Trustees. Thus, while Lord Aberdeen views his colleagues as visitors, controlling, when necessary, the general management, Lord Monteagle considers the primary authority to be vested in the Treasury, and the Trustees as merely the medium through which its instructions are conveyed (No. 5288, 5362.). Lord Overstone, again, though doubting whether there was originally any definite object or purpose in their appointment, looks upon them as representing the Treasury, and acting in its name and behalf; while Mr. William Russell regards their duties and responsibilities as too vague for him to define them, admitting, however, that his coadjutors have never 'considered that they have any clear or 'peremptory duty imposed upon them.' (No. 8077-8.) The officers of the Gallery are still more at variance on such points, and their evidence, if sifted, amounts pretty nearly to an abnegation of all responsibility whatever. Sir Charles Eastlake, when appointed Keeper by the Treasury, was merely enjoined to place himself under the direction of the Trustees, and conform to their orders; he addressed himself for instructions to the Assistant-keeper, and had an impression that he was accountable for all purchases and picture-cleaning, as well as for the general management and state of the collection and establishment: he also considered it his duty to make spontaneous suggestions to

* No. 5267-86.

the Trustees, as occasion might require. (No. 4392-5, 4414). But Mr. Uwins, who succeeded Sir Charles as Keeper, and took verbal instructions from him, entertains a much narrower view of his duties and responsibilities; disowns entirely the right to act without specific orders, unless in cases of emergency when no Trustees are in London; and denies that it lies with him to recommend picture-cleaning, even when that appears desirable (No 11—14, 33, 2862). His testimony on these points, and the view he takes of his position, are questioned by several Trustees; while his admission that pictures entrusted to Mr. Seguier's manipulations were under his charge or control, is pointedly denied by the latter. (No. 239-40, 276, 443—5.)

It thus would seem that the Trustees, installed without specific powers or instructions, acting on no fixed principles, for no defined purpose, and apparently unconscious of any responsibilities, occupy an anomalous and unintelligible position, in advance of the Treasury, which retains all real authority even over matters inferring a minimum of outlay. Yet, although unable to engage a door-keeper, or remove a stoker, without reference to that department of the State, the Trustees, *ex proprio motu*, accept or refuse gifts or bequests, and authorise wholesale cleanings of the pictures. Upon the rationale of such manifest inconsistencies, their Minutes throw no light, being generally brief, far from lucid, and quite useless as records fixing the responsibility of particular acts. Indeed, matters of moment, such as habitually dusting the pictures, and the discontinuance of oil-varnish, have been settled by verbal orders of a single Trustee, without formal approval or minute. Supposed regulations in some instances turn out to be merely usages; at other times rules appear in the Minutes, or are placarded on the Gallery door, which the Keeper ignores, or the Trustees disregard, and which are habitually departed from. Again, the late Keeper, Sir C. Eastlake, always understood it as necessary that there should be three Trustees to constitute a quorum, and 'that it 'would be always incorrect, or at least always irregular, for 'one, or even for two Trustees to transact any business whatever.' Yet the returns show, that at twenty-five meetings, affairs of more or less importance were disposed of by two, and on four occasions by even one Trustee. Sir Charles farther admits that 'in the Minutes the wording is sometimes 'loose;' and thus the Committee are at length brought to 'infer that, from the general mode in which both the regula-'tions and the Minutes have been made out, there was no 'system of intelligible or generally recognised regulation in 'force, under the late system of the Trustees, which could be

'a regular and constant guide to the conduct of the business of 'the institution.' As a natural corollary from all this, the late Keeper admits, 'that the late system of management, partly 'from want of a concentrated responsibility, and partly from 'the want of a distinct understanding by the different indi-'viduals or bodies of their respective duties or individual 'responsibilities, is defective and requires improvement.' (No. 6089, 5991-3, and 5943-72.) With this avowal, which may satisfy the most eager assailant, we proceed to consider,

II. The general results of such management. — Among these we find, — meetings at distant intervals, sparingly and irregularly attended; business conducted without unity of aims or action; contradictory orders emanating from different sets of Trustees; the late Keeper habitually acting upon Sir Robert Peel's individual sanction, when most of his colleagues were out of town; a general doubt or misapprehension throughout the entire establishment as to the nature and objects of each one's duties, and a complete absence of common understanding regarding the amount of individual responsibility, or the quarter where it is placed. And among many specific inconveniences which might be mentioned, there appear to have arisen doubts concerning gifts or bequests to the Gallery, in consequence of the non-corporate existence of any body as recipients of the national pictures, and an uncertainty whether the Trustees or the Treasury are their proper holders and administrators. In short, the evidence of the Gallery officers from p. 158. to p. 177., which must be absolved from all suspicion of preconcerted defence, contains a mass of inconsistencies, a series of misunderstandings, an amount of ignorance and confusion, of looseness and mystification, such as, — apart from other statements of these gentlemen, and the admissions of the Trustees, — ought to satisfy Parliament that a change in the existing system of management is indispensable.

III. We have now reached the results of the present management upon the preservation of our pictures. — The evidence affecting this branch of the investigation occupies a large portion of the huge volume before us, and we have neither space nor inclination fully to analyse its contents, or balance its startling contradictions. The Committee had to investigate whether the Keeper was empowered to clean pictures, or not? Whether he was consulted before the late cleaning, or not? Whether the pictures, one and all, required cleaning, or not? Whether they had been properly cleaned, or not? Whether by friction, or not? Whether entirely stripped of varnish, or not? Whether thereby damaged, or not? Whether the glazings

have been disturbed, effaced, or left pure? Whether these glazings were local, or consisted in a general toning? Whether the old masters did glaze, or not? Whether the pictures have, on the whole, been improved, or not? Whether they will yet improve, or not? Such were some of the moot points raised on this one division of the inquiry, and similar incongruities meet us at each subsequent stage, until the received rules of evidence become inapplicable, and baffled inquirers are tempted to exclaim with Pilate, 'What is truth?' This state of doubt demands some forbearance. That artists should differ as to the best processes in painting, or cleaners uphold their respective nostrums for renovating pictures, is quite natural: nay painters, restorers, and amateurs may well discuss with keenness supposed technical expedients of ancient artists, which none of them ever saw practised; or they may dispute whether certain works have or have not been injured by solvents and friction: but surely all this might be done apart from dogmatism, and without maintaining that, upon questions rather of degree than of fact, and liable above all others to varieties of conviction, and delicate distinctions in belief, 'there can be but one right opinion.'

The Royal Academy question has been freely dragged into this discussion, a morbid jealousy of that body, its actions and motives, being expressed by several witnesses: and as some gentlemen who come forward to impugn the cleanings are equally desirous of a tilt at the Academy, while those who most approve of the results are Academicians, it is difficult to throw off an impression that the affair partakes of a professional or sectarian wrangle. But, apart from such extraneous elements, and notwithstanding a strange discrepancy in technical views of Art and its processes, much sound criticism may be disinterred from the farrago of loose and irreconcileable statements which confuses the evidence. Unsatisfactory and disappointing as are such contradictions, it is not difficult to account for them. Picture-painting and picture-cleaning are in truth empirical processes, wherein many artists possess or pretend to secret methods. The vehicle which enabled the Van Eycks to leave their panels protected by an indurated and almost immoveable surface; the absorbent ground which received, and the lustreless varnish which protects, the tempera work of early Italian masters, the glazings that impart transparency and depth to the tones of Paul Veronese or Titian, are all vexed questions which many vainly long to solve. Those experiments whereby the ingenious Sir Joshua, and the wayward Turner, aimed at new or startling effects have often baffled imitators. Since then there exists no canon for painting, there can be no absolute rule for cleaning,

especially where varnish is to be removed. Expedients, on some occasions innocuous, become on others destructive; the solvent or friction which effaces delicate passages in certain pictures, leaving their colours crude, or even the grounding bare, has no perceptible influence upon works executed on a different principle. In this way we can explain many unhappy mistakes in practice, and may partly account for such wide diversities of opinion regarding the state of the pictures, or the fact of injuries having been committed, as meet us in this Blue-book. Before dealing, however, with these, let us see how the cleaning question stands.

The condition of the pictures purchased from Mr. Angerstein, and of those contributed by Sir George Beaumont and Mr. Holwell Carr, was sufficiently guaranteed by the taste and knowledge of these gentlemen. The works slowly added by the Trustees belonged almost necessarily to the same category. As most of its important canvasses and panels thus came to the Gallery in fine condition, the conservative duties of its Guardians were limited to occasionally refreshing the varnish. During Mr. William Seguier's keepership we accordingly hear little or nothing of cleaning: but as time wore on, a great change became gradually observable on a number of those paintings which had been longest in the Gallery. Although that gentleman had stated to a Parliamentary Committee in 1836, that they were 'generally in a very good state, 'not disguised by dirt, varnish, repaint, or other defects,'— yet, on his death, seven years later, their dulled surfaces so immediately attracted his successor's attention, that during 1844-5-6, seven of the most important were subjected to what we may call a thorough cleaning, in contradistinction from the occasional removal of superficial impurities. It is not easy to discover whether this sudden and extensive innovation on previous practice was the result of a systematic discrepancy of opinion between the two successive Keepers, as to the most desirable condition and treatment of such pictures, or if it is rather to be accounted for from the 'let alone' policy having been so long followed as to authorise sweeping and energetic remedies for a tardily admitted evil. However this may be, a plan was then, apparently for the first time, introduced, of cleaning, before admission to the Gallery, pictures purchased at very high prices. After the usual autumnal vacation of 1846, the public found some of their old favourites with new faces; and, although to most visitors this was matter of no moment, several connoisseurs came forward to impugn, through the daily press, such tampering with important monuments of

art. No very general feeling was however elicited in favour of a movement which, from the terms adopted by some of its supporters, appeared to be directed against the Royal Academy, through the Gallery Keeper, quite as much as pointed at the Trustees' management: but the cleaning operations, having become the subject of parliamentary interference, were virtually suspended until last autumn, when the wholesale and hurried manipulations inflicted upon nine capital works during a six weeks' vacation led to the present inquiry.

Whence comes it that pictures brought to the Gallery in fine state become, within a few years, dull or dark, as if covered by a 'thick film?' Such persons as favour a removal of the collection to another site ascribe this appearance to foul atmospherical influences, and ring the changes upon soot and smoke from without, dust and animal effluvia from within. The best answer to this is, that such paintings as never have received a coat of Gallery varnish present no dingy or opaque aspect, and stand in need of no scarifying process. The question thus becomes one of damage rather by systematic dirtying than by wanton cleaning, for had the Trustees only let well alone, and been careful to preserve the pictures with ordinary prudence, another generation at least might have enjoyed their beauties before the latter operation became necessary. It is now admitted that for many years the Gallery varnish has contained boiled oil, a mixture notoriously apt to produce exactly the bad effects here complained of; and, holding as we do its adoption as a serious mistake, it becomes important to look somewhat closely into the matter.

There is a tendency of pictures in this country, after being varnished in the usual way with gum-mastic dissolved in turpentine, to become covered with a filmy coating, such as that thrown by the breath on polished metal or glass. This film, when recent, may be wiped off without leaving any bad effects, or it may be prevented by mixing oil with the varnish, a practice found to be pernicious, in so far as oil not only darkens rapidly by exposure to air, and is peculiarly susceptible to atmospheric impurities, but also renders the varnish more difficult of removal. The Committee have not been able to trace how or when oil varnish was first introduced at the Gallery, and have received no distinct account of its composition. The Trustees seem never to have considered this matter at all; and even when, on the private suggestion of one or two of their number to Mr. Seguier, the varnish was recently abandoned, no report or minute appears of the change. Mr. Seguier, the restorer usually employed, avows ignorance of the ingre-

dients or process of making the varnish he uses; he cannot tell by whom it is prepared, as 'his porter always goes for it.' (No. 2954.) These facts are startling, but they are only a sample of the lax way in which the national pictures have been looked to.

Having thus accounted for the dull and discoloured state into which many of the pictures had fallen, and in which Mr. William Russell found them, while acting on the Commission of Inquiry in 1850, and when subsequently appointed a Trustee, we arrive at his evidence, which is rendered important by his ready admission that the recent cleaning was done in a great measure at his suggestion. Being satisfied, during the inquiry of 1850, that a number of them were no longer in a state creditable to the country and the Trustees, he was desirous, on the eve of the Great Exhibition of 1851, that some remedy should be found before they were seen by the numerous foreigners then likely to visit the National Gallery. His proposal to this effect was negatived in April 1851, by a resolution postponing the cleaning of two pictures then under consideration. But, in the belief that matters had become worse from the influx of unusual crowds during that year, he brought forward other suggestions the following spring*, the result of which was that, besides superficially washing many of the paintings, Mr. Seguier, during the autumn vacation of six weeks, cleaned twelve important ones, and thereby occasioned the present inquiry.

Reserving for the present the merits of that gentleman's operations, let us see how they were authorised by the Trustees. So far as can be gathered from the Minutes (loose regarding important matters, while most precise as to others of trifling and incidental character), Mr. Seguier had reported specially respecting certain pictures from which he wished to remove the varnish before revarnishing them; yet no such report, nor any list of the pictures, is engrossed in the proceedings of the Trustees. Neither is there a specific enumeration of the pictures committed to his care in the autumn of 1852: and although a list is afterwards given of those on which he actually had wrought, the nature of his operations is scantily indicated. Under these circumstances, it is scarcely surprising that the Trustees are at issue among themselves, whether the paintings cleaned were really those which Mr. Seguier had been instructed to undertake, nor that the list (whose existence is both affirmed and denied) is not forthcoming. This remissness at head quarters

* Minutes of February 9th, April 5th, and July 5th, 1852.

naturally mars all unity of action in the subordinate officers, left without distinct instructions, and with no general regulations to fall back upon. Thus, recurring to 1844, we find that Sir C. Eastlake, understanding himself as Keeper to be accountable for cleaning the pictures, and bound to propose this when desirable, did so on the 5th of August, and was in the most vague terms empowered to deal with such of them as he thought fit. The whole matter occupies but three and a half lines of the Minutes; and although it now appears that eleven pictures were cleaned during that vacation, we look in vain to the proceedings for such a fact. In the autumn of 1846 four others were dealt with, upon authority granted in terms scarcely more precise, and without any record of the pictures suggested by the Keeper, or of the operations he recommended. In each of those years the treatment was extended to a very important work freshly purchased and not yet exhibited in the Gallery; indeed Guido's 'Susanna,' bought during 1845, underwent immediate cleaning and restoration, without minuted instructions from any meeting of Trustees. The results to the various paintings do not appear ever to have been taken up for consideration, until the public press teemed with attacks, and a strenuous appeal from Mr. Morris Moore had been laid before the Trustees by their colleague, Lord Ellesmere, on the 25th January, 1847.

Sir Charles Eastlake, on retiring from office, told his successor, Mr. Uwins, that the governing body would look to him for suggestions as to cleaning their pictures, and would hold him answerable for what might be done. Mr. Uwins, however, is not aware that such suggestions form part of his duty, or that he has any responsibility in the matter, beyond seeing that pictures, when entrusted to Mr. Seguier by the Trustees, are not injured at his hands. He denies having been in any way consulted before the operations, as Mr. Seguier was; except in one instance (the Paul Veronese), he has never offered an opinion; and he did not consider it desirable to clean any but that one picture. Three of the Trustees hear these statements with surprise, and differ entirely from the Keeper as to his position and duties. Neither does Mr. Seguier distinctly confirm the assertion that he was consulted, apart from Mr. Uwins, as to the pictures recently treated, or allow that, these being in his hands, he was amenable to that officer for the expedients he might adopt. And, coming to matters of fact, he admits having raised the varnish of seven out of the nine pictures by friction, while, in three instances, he removed the whole of it; yet Mr. Uwins, who attended daily as a check upon his practice,

does not believe that the varnish was entirely removed from any picture, and never saw him resort to friction, which, had he been aware of it, he would have stopped as a dangerous process.

This, however, is by no means the most marvellous discrepancy which meets us. The filthy condition of the backs of the national pictures, and the danger of leaving dust and rubbish to accumulate on them, were strongly pointed out by the Commission of 1850, and by the Parliamentary Committee of that year. The Keeper, however, is not aware that this subject was referred to before that Committee, or discussed by the Trustees; and, as he does not regard such dorsal deposits of dirt to be pernicious, he thought no steps were called for to remove them until some large measure of future protection for the picture-backs should come to be adopted. Accordingly, he gave no orders for the pictures generally being taken down and dusted; such an operation could not have been done without his knowledge; and he does not believe it ever was performed. But Mr. Seguier recollects that, subsequent to the Report of 1850, the whole pictures were actually taken down, found in a dreadful state, and dusted. Colonel Thwaites confirms this fact, but thinks it happened before 1850: Mr. Thicke states that it was done by himself under Mr. Uwins' orders, during the vacation about three years ago. This remarkable failure of memory among the responsible parties is the more inconvenient, as the Minutes are silent on the subject.

The Trustees' recorded proceedings, with their own and their officers' evidence, too plainly show that the preservation of the national pictures has not hitherto been attended to on any matured system, or with a defined and adequate sense of individual responsibility. It is, therefore, not astonishing that the results have proved most unfortunate. By long use of a noxious varnish, the dimmed and dusky surfaces of certain pictures lost their peculiar beauties, and the proper qualities of the masters. In this state, of which Salvator Rosa's Mercury and the Woodman, or Claude's Death of Procris (No. 84 and 55) are still examples, they ceased to afford profit to students, or pleasure to amateurs, and were consequently condemned to be cleansed of the thick oily deposit which obscured them. Thus far there is no real discrepancy of opinion: but regarding the necessity of sending to that ordeal so many canvasses, and the treatment they have there undergone, we find every gradation of dissent, from the earnest denunciations of Mr. Morris Moore, to the playful satire of Mr. Ford. Apart from the Trustees and their officers, whom we exclude as parties,

twenty-three witnesses speak, with more or less precision, to the cleaning. They consist of five Royal Academicians, five other painters, five cleaners, and eight amateurs: of the entire number but one, an Academician, maintains Mr. Seguier's recent operations to have been innocuous, while a great majority consider that, in most cases, they were uncalled for. A result so decided renders it unnecessary to load our pages with technical details, irksome to ordinary readers. The amateurs are to a man unprepared to approve of the pictures in their present condition, when compared with that in which they were. Even those witnesses who showed some disposition to parry the questions conceded, for the most part, on searching examination, that the remedy had been carried too far, causing or unveiling mischiefs deeper and worse than those it proposed to cure. Nay, the Trustees themselves refrained from any strong individual expressions in support of their own Minute approving of Mr. Seguier's handiwork; and Sir Charles Eastlake admitted that, in several instances, this had been 'unnecessary,' 'injudicious,' 'unequal,' 'tasteless,' 'ill and partially' performed. (No. 4582–92.) Yet, after all this, the Committee, baffled apparently by minor discrepancies which pervade the evidence, have not only shrunk from any specific verdict upon the picture cleaning, but have thoroughly diluted their Chairman's marked, though general, condemnation of its effects, and of the mode in which it was conducted.

In contrast to this course, which we cannot but regret, let us refer to poor Haydon's impassioned diatribe, on seeing Rubens' Brazen Serpent 'utterly ruined during the vacation of 1844, 'the whole tone and superb glazing rubbed off.' 'They may 'talk as they please of the sufferings of humanity, but there is 'nothing so excites my sympathy as the helpless sufferings of a 'fine old oil picture of a great genius. Unable to speak or re-'monstrate, touching all hearts by its dumb beauty, appealing 'to all sympathies by its silent splendour, laid on its back in 'spite of its lustrous and pathetic looks, taken out of its frame, 'stripped of its splendid encasement, fixed to its rack to be 'scraped, skinned, burnt, and then varnished in mockery of its 'tortures, its lost purity, its beautiful harmony—and hung up 'again, castrated and unmanned, for living envy to chuckle 'over, whilst the shade of the mighty dead is allowed to visit 'and rest about its former glory, as a pang for sins not yet 'atoned for.'

On a review of this portion of the inquiry, it appears to us —First, that repeated applications of oil varnish had tarnished or obscured certain pictures in the Gallery, partly by attracting

atmospheric impurities, partly by its own tendency to darken. Second, that the pictures selected for thorough cleaning in 1846 and 1852 were not those most altered by that Gallery varnish, while none of them were otherwise particularly dirty. Third, that this was, in particular, the case with the two large Claudes, which the Trustees were especially bound to preserve from being tampered with, on the eve of hanging them in immediate contrast and rivalry with pictures by Mr. Turner, bequeathed to the nation on that express condition. Fourth, that, in compliance with instructions 'to complete, during the 'approaching vacation, the necessary operations for putting the 'pictures in order,' Mr. Seguier has, in some cases, cleared away a medium which, whether given in the process of originally finishing the paintings, or subsequently supplied by restorers, or the gradual result of mellowing influences, did impart a tone, harmony, or depth generally considered as characteristic of the artists. Fifth, that even could Mr. Seguier prove, which he has failed to do, the medium so removed to have been no part of the original process, or the want of harmony, gradation, and transparency now observable to have arisen from antecedent maltreatment, his work would still be liable to Sir C. Eastlake's criticism of 'tasteless.' Sixth, on the other hand, had Mr. Seguier, instead of honestly limiting himself, in terms of the Trustees' instruction, to what he considered a simple 'removal of the old varnish, and revarnishing,' retoned the pictures, as is usually done in similar cases, the late outcry would have been in some degree prevented, and their faulty condition masked from ordinary detection. Lastly, that the recently cleaned pictures, while hung in immediate contact with others embrowned by Gallery varnish, are exposed to a contrast unfair at once to their merits, and to Mr. Seguier's reputation.

IV. We now proceed to the results of the present management on the acquisition of pictures, especially by purchase.—The Angerstein, Beaumont, and Holwell Carr pictures, having been collected by private gentlemen for their own pleasure, naturally consisted of specimens chosen from supposed individual merit, rather than historical importance to art. These form the nucleus of our Gallery, and the same is the case with the Ollney, Farnborough, and Simmons bequests, as with nearly all pictures presented. Under such circumstances, it became the more desirable that the Trustees should, in their purchases, correct the tendency thus developed, and should endeavour to supply such examples as had not reached them from the liberality of amateurs. Again, seeing that taste has long run in

England upon the later masters of the Low Countries, or the eclectic schools of Italy, no stimulus in that direction was necessary; while the means of studying other classes of art became an obvious want. In particular, a Committee of the House of Commons in 1836 recorded their opinion that Italian pictures of, or anterior to, the time of Raffaele ought to be more sought after in future. With these principles in view, it would have been easy to adopt a system of purchasing calculated gradually to counterbalance the undue predominance acquired by certain styles of art. Nothing, however, of the sort was proposed; and, notwithstanding the Report of 1836, the number of Flemish and eclectic works since bought has equalled those from the best Italian epoch. This persistence becomes more worthy of notice if we bear in mind that, during the last fifteen years, a large number of valuable panels in the class thus neglected have been drawn from Italy to meet an increasing demand, while many others of the sort have been miserably destroyed by ignorant cleaners. And it consists with our knowledge that a few hundred pounds, judiciously expended in that country about 1836, would have obtained early works for which thousands would now be demanded. Nor is it to be overlooked, that during several years of the intervening period, Sir C. Eastlake, a gentleman reputed to possess great knowledge of Italian art, and the highest appreciation of its value, was, as Keeper, the *ex-officio* adviser on such points. We learn from his own evidence that a constant advocacy of this, his own favourite style, was rendered nugatory by the influence of Sir Robert Peel, who contended that 'curiosities' should not be collected. (No. 6023.) Thus, apart from its merits, the suggestion emanating from the Committee of 1836, and urged by the Keeper, was successfully thwarted by an individual Trustee, whose taste as a collector happened to lie in another direction.

We raise here no question respecting the merits of particular schools, as to which prejudices will always arise, from fashion or individual temperament. But we maintain that the administration of a National Gallery ought both to be exempt from such partisanship, and to discourage it. Catholic tastes are assuredly desirable in a public collection of whatever sort, where each visitor ought to be free, not only to indulge his own preferences, but to test them by contrast with whatever else is important. And when we apply this canon in Trafalgar Square, we are struck by the fact that the masters there least represented are just those whom our countrymen have elsewhere fewest opportunities of seeing—such as the early painters of Italy, Germany, and Flanders, the greatest ones of Spain and France. Indeed,

we must protest against the fact, 'admitted by members of the 'Trust, that the additions to the collection have not been made 'on any definite principle, whether with a view of imparting to 'it completeness, of illustrating the history of art, or of raising 'the standard of national taste.' (p. vi.)

Thus far regarding what has been ignored or overlooked. Let us now see what and how purchases have been made. In Mr. William Seguier's original appointment as Keeper, he is enjoined 'to value and negotiate (if called upon) the purchase of 'any pictures that may in future be added to the collection' (p. iii.); but no power is given to him, or any one else, to select, propose, or decide upon such purchases. The Trustees' Minutes, previous to his death in November, 1843, have not been printed, so we know nothing of the practice in that period, beyond what the catalogue tells us. His successor, Sir C. Eastlake, appears to have accepted office on condition of 'being consulted 'chiefly respecting Italian works,' as he held himself to be 'very indifferently acquainted with the Northern schools;' meaning thereby with their artistic merit apart from *value*, as to which he considered himself generally an incompetent judge, and never afterwards offered an opinion. (No. 4393. 4398. 6005–9.) The Minutes being from thenceforward accessible, we are enabled, through them and the evidence, to trace the Trustees' procedure. The new Keeper's first endeavour was to secure for the nation some *chefs-d'œuvre* from the Fesch gallery; in particular Raffaele's Crucifixion, now belonging to Lord Ward; Pordenone's Madonna with the Doctors, which graces the Steidl Institute at Frankfort; and Del Piombo's grand Visitation, which has lately passed from Mr. Davenport Bromley to the Duke of Northumberland. (No. 6029–33.) But this fair beginning gave few results. 'It required great 'persuasion on the part of Sir Charles to induce the Trustees 'to listen to his recommendation;' and when eventually brought to public competition, all these pictures exceeded their limits of price. The Solly and Ottley collections, both rich in early Italian panels, were thereafter sold in London without an effort by the governing body; to which may be added the more varied but important ones of Lord Ashburnham and Mr. Coningham, at a time when Sir Charles was no longer in office. Other transactions were chiefly among the very class of works as to which he had by anticipation renounced official responsibility, one of them the unfortunate, so-called, Holbein; and while, out of eighteen pictures, for which Mr. W. Seguier had successfully negotiated, nine belonged to the best days of Italian Art, but two of the eleven acquired through his suc-

cessor dated from that bright era. The natural inference is, that, although nominally responsible for purchases, up to the date of a Treasury Minute issued at his own 'express request,' in consequence of the Holbein blunder, the Keeper, in fact, exercised very limited influence, at least in this matter.

The history of that blunder is as follows:—At the first Trustees' meeting in 1845 (March 3rd), 'a letter was read 'from M. S. J. Rochard, offering to submit to them for pur-'chase two pictures, by Holbein and Morales. Resolved, that 'M. Rochard be informed (by a letter in form No. 3.) that he 'has the authority of the Trustees for sending the picture by 'Holbein to this Gallery, for their inspection previous to their 'next meeting.' On the 7th April, 'Read letters from M. S. J. 'Rochard of the 1st and 25th of March, offering for sale three 'pictures by Holbein, Morales, and Giorgione, the first and 'last of which were brought to their view. Resolved, that 'Mr. Eastlake is empowered by the Trustees to negociate the 'purchase of the picture, "A Portrait, by Holbein," at a price 'not exceeding 800 guineas. The purchase of the pictures by 'Giorgione and Morales declined.' On 5th May, 'Mr. East-'lake reported that, in pursuance of the authority given him by 'the Minute of the Trustees of the 7th ult., he had agreed with 'M. S. J. Rochard for the purchase of a picture, "A Portrait, '"by Holbein," for the sum of 600 guineas. Resolved, that 'this purchase is approved by the Trustees, and that a letter 'be addressed to the Lords of the Treasury, requesting their 'Lordships to sanction the purchase, and to give directions for 'the payment to M. S. J. Rochard of the above-named sum.' Sir C. Eastlake's evidence, explaining these Minutes, extends from No. 6172. to 6188. The gist of it is, that 'with due care 'he might have prevented the purchase of that picture,' when 'brought under the notice of the Trustees by one of their 'number,' but that 'being greatly disappointed that the Ghir-'landaio had been ultimately declined, he was indifferent at 'that moment, under a feeling of disappointment, as to what 'the Trustees might do, and especially when it was a question 'respecting a picture which was not of the [Italian] school, 'which he was always recommending: that threw him off his 'guard.' Sir Charles adds, that when the picture was found to be spurious, he arranged himself to take it over from the Trustees; and that 'when Sir R. Peel insisted on his not 'interfering, or taking the responsibility on himself, which he 'considered he ought to have done, he said, "If that be the '"case, I should wish it to be clearly understood that the '"Keeper is not responsible, and that his advice is not to be

'"taken in any case:" and thereupon came that letter from 'the Treasury, directing the Trustees to appoint two persons, 'whoever the Keeper might recommend, to give an opinion.' (No. 6172-88.) After these revelations, we shall probably hear little more of this mistake being 'exclusively the fault of Sir 'Charles Eastlake.' A more serious consideration, however, arises. Conscious of how little practical avail, under the existing management, had been the precaution thus adopted at his own suggestion, that gentleman returns before the Committee to detail the way in which a purchase was made, even while this inquiry was in progress. (No. 7027-52.) The sum of the matter is, that the Treasury order of 1845 being found 'im-'possible or extremely injudicious,' it is in practice abandoned, pictures being purchased *before* opinions are formally taken as to their merits; and that one of the Trustees feels impelled to show the Committee how ill 'this regulation works, and what 'are the objections to the present system.'

The Minutes teem with offers of pictures for sale, declined *en masse* at the close of each sitting, and bequests are often disposed of with scarcely more ceremony. This summary dealing may be explained by Sir Charles's statement, that it 'is 'extraordinary how few the occasions were on which he had 'to report any degree of merit whatever.' (No. 6011, 12.) Beset by ignorance, vanity, and interested motives, the Trustees did well to make short work; yet while we find the eminent names of Buchanan, Ottley, and Fradelle recurring among the mass, it is difficult to repress curiosity regarding *their* rejected overtures. Many other proposals meet with more special notice, the grounds of refusal being occasionally indicated; but it is only on turning to Sir C. Eastlake's evidence that we learn how contrary it was to his judgment that works like Mrs. Bonar's Ghirlandaio, or Mr. Buchanan's Luini in *tempera* were rejected; and how greatly he regretted that such rare opportunities were lost as the Lucca, Ashburnham, Solly, Ottley, and Coningham sales afforded. We cannot, of course, go into all similar omissions. One case, though not directly affecting the Trustees, demands notice. Sir Thomas Lawrence having availed himself of the chances offered after the peace, to bring together a series of old drawings probably unequalled, they were offered to the nation by his executors for 20,000*l.* Some of them being at that time shown by Mr. Eastlake to Lord Lansdowne and Lord Brougham, in presence of Talleyrand, the Frenchman exclaimed, 'Si vous n'achetez 'pas ces choses là, vous êtes des barbares!' The Premier, however (Lord Grey), opposed the purchase, and the plan of

a public subscription, although headed by the Royal Academy for 1000*l.*, and by its present President for 100*l.*, came to nothing. In 1835, the drawings passed into Mr. Woodburn's hands, who again offered the whole to the nation for, it is said, 25,000*l.*, which was also refused. Years afterwards, when the collection had been broken up, Dr. Wellesley, Mr. Eastlake, and Mr. Josi were asked to value the Raffaele and Michael Angelo drawings, which had been once more placed at the disposal of Government for 20,000*l.*, and this also was declined, although their valuation reached 30,000*l.* A mere portion of that lot were eventually secured by private liberality for Oxford, but the whole series, originally rejected for the nation at 20,000*l.*, brought above 60,000*l.*, and, in Sir C. Eastlake's opinion, would have been an advisable public acquisition at 50,000*l.*

As regards purchases during the last ten years, Mr. Morris Moore has got up his case against the Gallery with telling effect, and we consider this the most important part of his voluminous evidence. Picture damage is a question of degree, and of individual opinion, but the statistics of picture sales and prices may be put beyond controversy. Thus, we find that within this period four works ascribed to Raffaele, one of them well known in Italy, the others beautiful cabinet specimens, have been sold in London auction-rooms, without competition from the Trustees; that their united prices amounted to 1683*l.* 7*s.*; that during the same time there have been bought for the Gallery an indifferent and repulsive example of Guido for 1680*l.*; an injured Velasquez for 2200*l.*; that the small 'St. Anthony,' by Annibale Caracci, has cost the nation 750 guineas, being as much as the important Gabrielli Raffaele brought at Mr. Coningham's sale; that a Palma Vecchio, for which Mr. W. Woodburn was authorised to bid 1500*l.* at the Soult auction, fell into his hands for 168*l.*, but has been repudiated at that price.

These are but a portion of the extreme cases brought out by Mr. Moore's careful scrutiny of the Trustees' purchases in contrast with their opportunities, and we regret that our limits prevent us from extracting his answers to Queries 9945—10,007., not only as establishing what might have been done with the funds actually spent, but as powerfully setting forth the true principles to be kept in view while selecting. We must, however, demur to his ascribing the exclusive blame of all errors and omissions to gentlemen connected with the Royal Academy. (No. 9,956. 10,010.) The public mainly owe to his unwearied remonstrances an inquiry which can hardly fail

in future to protect their interests and property; but even a good cause may be marred by a parade of partisanship, and his persistence in charging upon Sir C. Eastlake the neglect of opportunities, which in fact while Keeper he vainly urged upon the Trustees, savours of professional polemics. On the other hand, had Mr. Moore extended his catalogue of omissions beyond the range of remarkable sales in London, it might have been greatly augmented. In regard to prices, it may be idle to denounce them as often excessive, seeing that no other property is so liable to accidental fluctuations and individual impulse; but, after all, the fairest test, especially where acquisitions are not necessitated in order to carry out a plan, or complete a cycle, seems that adopted by Mr. Moore, of seeing what the same money might have procured elsewhere. And the circumstance that but one Gallery picture has cost under 200*l.*, while the whole seventy-four stand the nation about 1700*l.* each, can leave no doubt that the Trustees have bought in the dearest markets, and paid high for the incidental reputation of works as well as their merit.

The management of the National Gallery, as brought out before the Committee, leads us to the following results. The Trustees—at present seventeen—are indefinite in number and unpaid; they meet monthly for half the year; there is no provision for conducting business during the remaining months; there is no stated quorum, and although three are understood to be necessary, business is habitually done by two, or even by one Trustee; the Trustees, Keeper and Secretary are named by the Treasury, with no definite duties, regulations, or responsibilities, and have no clear apprehension of what these are; the Minutes are loosely kept, and give no complete record of important proceedings; the artist usually employed in cleaning the pictures has been allowed, without inquiry, to employ a varnish generally regarded as noxious, which has obscured and dirtied many of them. Such a practice has eventually led to their being cleaned by removing the varnish, but this delicate operation being loosely sanctioned and performed, the Trustees and their officers are not at one regarding the pictures pointed out, the processes employed, or the effects produced, while a great majority of witnesses condemn the results as more or less injurious to highly important works of Art. The acceptance of gifts and bequests is not maturely regulated; there is no system in making purchases, their discovery, selection, qualities, and character, being matter of haphazard; the most favourable opportunities are habitually neglected, while acquisitions of inferior importance, and at excessive prices, are from time to

time made. There being in this respect no definite procedure laid down, nor any adequate critical test provided, all is done by impulse or chance: hence the governing body either shelter themselves by inaction, or pay enormously for pictures of reputation. Each purchase requiring a special grant from the Treasury, to be afterwards approved by Parliament, opportunities are lost before so cumbrous a machinery can be put in motion, and thus the whole matter depends rather on State exigencies than considerations of Art. In short, after the national collection of pictures has existed for thirty years as a public institution, and after the large outlay for its purposes, no one can tell in whom it really is vested, nor say where the powers and control of the Treasury and the Trustees respectively begin or terminate, nor define the functions of these bodies, or of the Gallery officers. Consequently there is no intelligible method in the management, no common action among the rulers or their subordinates. All is loose, or accidental, or disputed.

While compelled thus to denounce the system and its consequences, we are grateful to the Trustees generally for many onerous and unrequited labours. Most of them give the State good service in other departments, their time and faculties being occupied by far more weighty interests. And the unreasonable extension of their number fairly extenuates laxity of attendance, especially as it is preposterous that twelve or fifteen statesmen should assemble, in order to discuss the merits and wages of candidates for a stokership, or to inquire about the disappearance of Mr. Greenwood's umbrella. It is therefore satisfactory to find that the unfavourable conclusions at which we have reluctantly arrived, after a patient and impartial analysis of the Blue-book, are in a great measure forestalled by draft reports on cleaning and management, submitted to the Committee by their Chairman, Colonel Mure. These drafts were indeed materially modified, as to method, terms, and prospective management; but the digest of evidence, when finally sanctioned in Committee, did not substantially differ from that proposed by the Chairman. The evidence itself forms a singular record of hazy recollections, random assertions, and crude opinions, its tendency unquestionably being to destroy confidence in the present constitution and procedure of the governing body. In this way we are brought to consider the remedies suggested or required.

The first resolution adopted by the Committee for the future control of the Gallery is 'That a system of management by a 'Board of Trustees should be continued;' and a subsequent

one enjoins that they be appointed by the Treasury. As the proposals to discontinue *ex-officio* Trustees, and to diminish the entire number as vacancies may occur, do not effect any important modification, it is difficult to read these words in any other sense than that matters are to remain as heretofore, in so far as the governing body is concerned. Thus far the Committee were unanimous; but it would rather seem that some consents may have been given to these startling propositions, in the hope of thereafter restricting the Trustees to be a merely visiting and inspecting body, Lord Elcho's motion to that effect having been lost. Other suggestions on this head are that a salaried Director, appointed by the Treasury for a definite time, shall supersede the Keeper, and that he shall recommend in writing all purchases to the Trustees, they having the disposal of a fixed sum to be annually voted by Parliament for pictures. Various amendments on these propositions were successively negatived, — such as that the Keeper should be replaced by a Board of three, with co-ordinate powers; that the Director should be alone responsible for purchases; that he should share this burden with a Committee of the Trustees; and that the annual parliamentary grant should not be of fixed amount. To persons acquainted with the forms of the House of Commons, it is unnecessary to say that as the chairman votes only in case of equal divisions, his opinions, when at variance with those of his colleagues, cannot be put on record except through a draft report; this however not being generally understood or kept in view by critics of the Report before us, Colonel Mure has thought it right to explain, through the newspapers, that he was no party to the resolutions adopted by his Committee. Thus it appears that the character of the Trust is to remain unchanged, nor is any provision made against the manifold inconveniences hitherto arising from an absence of regulations, duties, or defined responsibility, except that every picture purchased by the Trustees shall be recommended by the Director, and that all picture-cleaning should be submitted to stringent, though perhaps complicated, checks. It is difficult to read this paltry result, without regretting that it should have occupied the valuable time of seventeen accomplished gentlemen, during fifteen weeks. We venture to think that it very inadequately meets the acknowledged evils they had to consider, and we believe it is not hailed as a boon by those who would gladly see matters put into better train.

But while demurring to the more important recommendations of the Committee, we are anxious to advert to other plans of amelioration, offered by various witnesses in more or less matured

form, and considered in the Chairman's draft report. Unity of powers and action being the obvious remedy for lax and defective control, a disposition to concentrate duties and responsibilities on one individual was to be looked for. Accordingly, the favourite panacea of several advisers is that a supreme Dictator should manage our whole art collections, at all events the national pictures. The idea was put forth by Mr. Dyce, R.A., in a pamphlet formerly noticed by us,* and it has been advocated, with more or less tinkering, in the evidence of Mr. Ford, Mr. Hawkins, and Dr. Wellesley. But as the hypothetical blessings of a utopian despotism are ever frustrated by the want of a model despot, these gentlemen, when pressed as to the Director's qualifications and powers, have generally some modifying nostrum to hamper his action, and shelter their own, if not his, responsibility. Sir C. Eastlake observes, with great truth, 'the qualifications for connoisseurship are various, and 'are rarely united in one and the same person. The connoisseur 'should, first, possess the artist's knowledge with regard to 'pictorial merit in an absolute sense, independently of names of 'masters and historical associations. He should, in the next 'place, be thoroughly acquainted with the history of schools, 'and the practice, including the changes of style, of individual 'painters. He should possess an extensive knowledge of the 'principal works of the masters, and of the vicissitudes of those 'works, in regard to change of place, possessors, and price. 'The connoisseur should farther be acquainted with the works 'of the imitators of such masters; he should be aware of the 'number of repetitions of a given master's productions, with 'more or less assistance from scholars, and should ascertain 'which is the best of those repetitions.' And when asked whether he could, among his own acquaintance, lay hand on any person so qualified, Sir Charles, like the others to whom a similar inquiry was addressed, avows himself unprepared to do so. (No. 6509.) Mr. Ford again frankly admits that 'whoever 'becomes the Director of a national gallery of pictures must be 'a brave man,' and that 'the mere fact of the existence of a free 'press in this country would add very much to his difficulties, 'because he would be sure to be attacked by anonymous cor-'respondents.' (No. 8008-9.) And Dr. Wellesley, denouncing the present system as vicious, considers that the fault depends upon 'the representative system of this country controlling the 'expenditure of money,' and regards 'the constitution of Par-'liament as unfavourable to making a fine collection, worthy of

* Vol. xcvii. p. 416.

'the nation.' (No. 9575-6.) Mr. Dennistoun, while inclined to the theory of an undivided management, thinks, 'after much 'consideration, that this expedient would infer passing from one 'great inconvenience to another, and perhaps a greater;' and having enumerated the necessary qualifications, 'despairs of 'finding them all in any one individual,' who might probably, if found, 'be too sensitive to accept, at all events long to retain, 'a situation that would necessarily bring upon him, unsustained 'by the opinion of a Board acting along with him, the whole 'brunt of popular criticism, or possibly of public indignation.' (No. 5773-4.) Finally, Lord Aberdeen observes that, 'in a 'country where there is the same freedom of discussion that 'there is here, I should not envy the person occupying such a 'position, * * * while it would be extremely difficult to find 'such a one;' (No. 5304. 5314.) an opinion emphatically confirmed by Mr. William Russell. (No. 8160-2.)*

Giving apparently much weight to these objections, Sir C. Eastlake put in a proposal which, although deficient in unity of action, claims our attention, not only because, being in writing, it is somewhat less crude than the others, but as coming from one who, after ample experience as Keeper and Trustee, avows himself 'not prepared to defend the present system.' The fol-

* We question the policy, apart from the justice, of impugning through the daily press every act of the Trustees,—a practice of late much on the increase, especially when the Royal Academy can be in any way simultaneously attacked,—and of submitting to discussion, through its columns, each purchase made for the national collection. We happen to know that, when recently disposing of a picture, both desirable and desired for the Gallery, its owner informed one of the Trustees that he would on no account sell it to them, and thereby expose a favourite work of art, and perhaps himself, to invidious newspaper controversy. Thus, the opportunity of an acquisition of the very class most wanted has been irretrievably lost; and, although the right of criticism is beyond question, if it be so exercised as to scare away important additions by sale or gift, its value becomes doubtful. Such systematic attacks must obviously tend to deprive the country of the services of men really competent to watch over its æsthetic interests, devoted as they generally are to pursuits which, by bringing them into habitual intercourse and contact with ideal beauty and refinement, at once disqualify and disincline their votaries for the rude tustle of newspaper recrimination. And seeing that the opinions, even of experienced connoisseurs, are after all matters of impression not of fact, of fluctuating taste not of abstract truth, ever subject to conflicting judgments, it is surely not too much to expect that, by such men at least, they should be formed with forbearance, and expressed without dogmatism.

lowing outline conveys its principal features. A permanent Board to be established, in connection with some public department, to consist of three Gallery officials, with such representatives of government as might be appointed, meeting periodically, and publishing annual reports. The three officials to be a Superintendent, charged with the general control within the building, including attendants, students, and financial concerns; a Director entrusted with the selection and valuation of purchases, and with the preservation and cleaning of the pictures; a Secretary, whose chief business would consist not only in preparing catalogues of the Gallery, but in gathering, verifying, and recording particulars of every important picture, existing in Europe or described in books. The correspondence to be devolved upon an Under-Secretary, without a seat at the Board. All these functionaries to give their whole time, receiving salaries, and, except the Director, residing at the Gallery. They would be independent and separately accountable; their mutual relations, and the details of their duties, are left somewhat vague, and scarcely bear the searching inquiries put by the Committee; but the prominent and original trait of the plan is connected with the Secretary's labours. It may appear a singular fancy that the British Government should pay a person to draw up elaborate inventories, on the model proposed by Sir Charles, of pictures which there is but a remote chance of ever reaching this country; yet such a register would gradually prove of inestimable value for regulating acquisitions, and in its progress could not fail to educate the Secretary as a thorough connoisseur. It would also become the basis of much more exact information regarding what the old masters have really effected, than the world as yet enjoys, and on these grounds the suggestion may deserve some favourable attention. Apart from it, the plan seems to aim at so employing the time and abilities of three officers as to concentrate on each the peculiar duties of his department, while the whole should form a deliberative body.

The same end would, however, as we conceive, be attained more simply, and with fewer practical obstacles, by a paid Board of three or five, acting with co-ordinate powers. This idea, to which we are on the whole disposed to give our adherence, is, to a greater or less extent, adopted by Mr. Russell, Mr. Coningham, Mr. Hurlstone, Mr. Foggo, and Mr. Dennistoun, although by some of these gentlemen it is encumbered by supervision, and other conditions detracting from its free development. The important and difficult point would be to concentrate action, and individualise responsibility, while thus

bringing into requisition the talents and acquirements of several persons, for duties demanding a wide diversity of knowledge, and dealing with a great variety of tastes. With this view, it is proposed to impose a very stringent responsibility upon each member of the Board, compelling their attendance at frequent meetings throughout the entire year, and requiring their written approval of every important transaction, such as purchases or picture-cleaning. The object would be 'to secure good and constant work,' in a belief that 'the 'opinion of five well-qualified gentlemen, or of a majority of 'these, would and ought to weigh more with the public, even 'if they are not entirely satisfied, than the opinion of a single 'individual.' (Nos. 5760. 5783. 5776.) And although Lord Aberdeen has not gone so far as to propose any scheme to supersede the existing system (which he in no way attempts to justify), he seems to point at principles leading to these very results. (Nos. 5289-90. 5318. 5320. 5334.) Simplicity is, however, of great importance, and to that any continuance of the Trustees as a superintending or controlling body appears fatal.

The Committee have applied themselves with laudable anxiety to the discovery of adequate precautions in regard to picture-cleaning. Those proposed by the Chairman are somewhat more stringent than the suggestions ultimately adopted; but in neither case is there much novelty, while some of the regulations go into technicalities scarcely within the grasp of such a tribunal. On the whole, we should say that this, like other points, might be safely left to the discretion of a small competent Board, with a proviso, however, that the removal of old varnish shall be authorised only after the Keeper's written report upon urgent cases, where the obscurity of a work is such as to prevent its proper qualities being enjoyed or studied, and where no extraordinary risk seems to attend that process. Farther, that each commission should be entrusted by the Board to the restorer most skilled in that particular description of art, with specific instructions, he alone being held liable for their due implement. But the main point is, that, by regular and careful wiping of the surfaces, and by employing the best varnish when these require to be refreshed, all more extensive manipulations should be long, if not indefinitely, postponed.*

* To instance the multiplicity of opinions in trifling matters, we may refer to the various ways of wiping pictures recommended to the Committee by different experts. 1, dusting with a feather-brush; 2, dry wiping with an old silk handkerchief; 3, wiping with a wet

It is satisfactory to find that the recommendation which we formerly made of a stated annual parliamentary grant for purchases is approved by the evidence, and adopted in the Report; but we consider it a great oversight, that neither a code of regulations nor an annual report to the House of Commons is rendered imperative, as proposed by the Chairman. And, seeing that a national art-museum ought to include a series of favourable examples, exhibiting chronologically and critically the progress of painting at various periods, while showing its origin, development, and successive transitions in style, we cordially adopt the following dictum of the Committee:—

'The intelligent public of this country are daily becoming alive to the truth, which has long been recognised by other enlightened nations, that the arts of design cannot be properly studied, or rightly appreciated, by means of insulated specimens alone: that, in order to understand or profit by the great works, either of the ancient or modern schools of art, it is necessary to contemplate the genius which produced them, not merely in its final results, but in the mode of its operation; in its rise and progress, as well as in its perfection. A just appreciation of Italian painting can as little be obtained from an exclusive study of the works of Raffaele, Titian, or Correggio, as a critical knowledge of English poetry from the perusal of a few of its master-pieces. What Chaucer and Spenser are to Shakspeare and Milton, Giotto and Masaccio are to the great masters of the Florentine school; and a national gallery would be as defective without adequate specimens of both styles of painting, as a national library without specimens of both styles of poetry. In order, therefore, to render the British National Gallery worthy of the name it bears, your Committee think that the funds appropriated to the enlargement of the collection should be expended with a view, not merely of exhibiting to the public beautiful works of art, but of instructing the people in the history of that art, and of the age in which, and the men by whom, those works were produced.'

Having thus considered in its various bearings the Management of the National Gallery, we have but little room left for what seems to us the subsidiary question of Site. Those who advocate a costly removal of the collection maintain that it is at present irreparably exposed to detrimental influences; that the space is too contracted for the necessary enlargements; and that it is desirable to centralise the principal art-museums of the metropolis in a more eligible position. Let us examine these plans in detail.

---

or moist sponge; 4, ditto, with an old soft wet linen rag; 5, ditto, with wet cotton wool; 6, the application of a liquid secretion unfit for ears polite.

I. Coming from climates of brighter sky and liquid air, Dr. Waagen and Baron von Klenze are, like other foreigners, dismayed by the dense and smoke-stained atmosphere of the Thames. They feel its leaden action on their temperament, observe its soots begriming their linen, and conclude that such an influence must be deleterious to health, and destructive to all beautiful objects. They see the marbles at the British Museum dusty and discoloured, and many pictures at the National Gallery almost equally obscured, so they ascribe both results to one noxious cause. The like impressions tell in a minor degree upon ourselves: a cry for removal of the national pictures is raised, and is gladly seconded by the Gallery officials, who, if relieved from daily dustings and hebdomadal washings, would enjoy a comparative sinecure. The impulse thus given by prejudice and self-interest is alleged to be seconded by Royal Academicians, in hopes that, should the old masters be ousted from 'the finest situation in Europe,' the vacant quarter might be theirs. But if, at Trafalgar Square, the smoke and dust from without, the exhalations of crowded humanity from within, are ruinous to ancient canvasses, indurated by *patina* and varnish, how fare the freshly painted and still unprotected surfaces of modern works in more crowded saloons under the same roof? True, the former remain there for years, the latter for months. Yet, if conscious that the situation is peculiarly injurious, would artists expose, without remonstrance, their valuable property, and hazard their enduring reputation in these and other adjacent exhibition-rooms? or would the Academicians there permanently place their diploma-pictures and other important works? But, since the question is made one peculiarly of ancient paintings, are we to believe that the Dukes of Northumberland and Sutherland, Sir Robert Peel, Lord Ellesmere, Mr. Rogers, and other connoisseurs, wilfully keep their admirable collections in a quarter ascertained to be dangerous above other parts of London; or that the Messrs. Woodburn have long preferred the same foul neighbourhood to deposit sale pictures of rare merit and importance? Probabilities being thus against the prevailing impression, how stand the facts? We have already shown the pictures that have become darkened at the Gallery to be those on which an oil varnish has been applied, the noxious qualities of which are very generally condemned, while others, uniformly refreshed with mastic varnish, remain in a satisfactory condition. We are, therefore, entitled to believe, that, with ordinary precautions in dusting, wiping, and varnishing, no farther complaints on this head need arise. It is made unfortunately palpable in evidence, that damage from dirt and

smoke is infinitely more fatal and permanent to marbles; but should that plea be considered to warrant removal in either case from the seat of mischief, very effectual measures would probably be desirable, and a still purer atmosphere than the West End should be sought out, in order to warrant the inconvenience and expense of new galleries. Yet the argument might lead to results little foreseen by its supporters. If objects of art are really so damaged by London smoke, the sooner public and private collections go to the provinces the better. The metropolis would thus be shorn of half its attractions, while the wealthiest and most cultivated community of our countrymen might learn that money given for short-lived painting and sculpture is misspent.

To us, who avoid the National Gallery on the few holidays when it is much frequented, the alleged mischief of dense crowds and dirty visitors appears exaggerated: yet, if facilities of access elsewhere withheld are here abused, very simple regulations might suffice to remedy the evil, without operating as an exclusion to any. Double swing doors, and tickets taken a few yards off, would keep out much dust and some idlers. But ready admission seems to us of primary importance, and hence the value we attach to the present situation. There is probably no spot in the world where so many human beings daily pass for business or pleasure. Those who would for a moment rest their jaded limbs, or relieve their harassed thoughts; who change their omnibus at Charing Cross, or have miscalculated an appointment, or are caught in a shower, here find a refuge at hand, and in it a series of objects ennobling to the mind, improving to the taste, soothing to the spirits. As some who enter church to scoff remain to pray, so men who ascend the Gallery steps for convenience often find improvement: and to many, a few minutes thus stolen from the cares of material existence, to gaze on Del Piombo's Miracle, or Claude's Arcadian scenes, will continue, like the oasis in the desert, a sweet memory amid a joyless retrospect. Mr. Foggo well says, 'I perfectly agree with that beautiful opinion expressed by 'Sir Robert Peel, when the National Gallery was first pro-'posed, that, placed in the centre and in the full stream of 'London industry, persons of various classes would all meet in 'mutual good-will; and I do think that to remove it from the 'centre through which everybody at times has to pass, and 'where many men who cannot afford a whole day in going 'after a picture, can for a single hour just go and see what the 'nation has done for the enjoyment of the people, would be 'exceedingly injurious and imprudent.'

II. If, however, it be proved that the accommodation in

Trafalgar Square cannot be sufficiently extended for the eventual requirements of the Gallery, the question of site will assume another aspect. Additional space is urgently needed, and may be sought by taking in the eastern portion of the building, now occupied by the Royal Academy; by projecting the whole front elevation to the railing; or by a back extension over the ground covered by the workhouse. Assuming the Academy to claim compensation, and admitting that a workhouse need not have one of the choicest positions in London, all this becomes a mere question of expense.* Although quite inadequate for centralised museums of sculpture, &c., this space would abundantly provide picture galleries on the largest scale, leaving undisturbed the barracks, which the authorities have wisely decided to retain as a military position. In this view, drawings alone would become ancillary to the collection of paintings, the engravings remaining annexed to the Museum library.

III. Before, however, this question of site can be satisfactorily entertained, it will be necessary to dispose of the more extensive one, which has been raised by a recent proposal to centralise the principal museums and literary institutions of London. With this view, there have lately been secured to the public above eighty acres of open ground at Kensington Gore, between Hyde Park and Brompton, and much evidence, of the usual vague and discursive character, has been tendered in reference to its application. The prevailing theory seems to be that in this, or some adjacent space, the National Gallery, the artistic and monumental departments of the British Museum, the establishments for art education, and the principal literary or scientific societies should be clustered, for the benefits of mutual reference and intercommunion. The vastness of this idea lends it a questionable grandeur, and veils many difficulties both of plan and execution. The vacated sculpture-galleries and halls at the Museum would be a welcome relief to the groaning bookshelves under Mr. Panizzi's charge; and it is pretty generally agreed that statuary would be usefully located near the pictures. But here arise doubts as to separating art from archæology, æsthetics from antiquities. Although the Elgin marbles may well be classed with Raffaele's and Del Piombo's panels, must their migration be attended by Egyptian mythology, Assyrian monsters and polyglot inscriptions? Or does not a stronger analogy of interest bind these, and the medals, to the library than to the plastic collections? Again,

* The matter in hand is sufficiently complicated without now going into the merits or claims of the Academy, which would of course be fully looked into on any such arrangement as we point at.

would the admitted inconvenience, risk, and great cost of transporting ponderous masses of stone be compensated by its advantages? Yet, supposing the project partially adopted, it might be arranged to assemble near the paintings all marbles and casts of æsthetic merit, along with the drawings and engravings, a library of art being supplied; sculpture of archæological or ethnological interest would remain at the Museum; while minor artistic rarities, such as nielli, enamels, bronzes, terra-cottas, vases, pottery, ceramic ware, carvings in ivory, metal, or wood, might with propriety be annexed to the one or the other, or might together form a third collection. But, should all these become concentrated in an open suburban locality, is the management to be centralised, as well as the site? and are we to render the discovery of a qualified supreme Director still more hopeless by so large an accession to our demands upon his time and intelligence, and by so great a burden of varied duties?

The Committee have shown much reserve in dealing with these complex considerations. While reluctantly surrendering the present site of the Gallery, and disposed to recommend for it the one at Kensington Gore, they, in a great measure, evade the centralisation question referred to them, by suggesting that a Royal Commission be named to dispose of it. In this they have probably done well; a smaller tribunal than theirs being better fitted to adjudicate upon the evidence they have carefully elicited. But when Government takes up this matter, we trust it will bear in mind that the prejudices against Trafalgar Square date only from the Commission of 1850, a Select Committee having in 1848 reported favourably as to enlarging the present Gallery, on account of, among other reasons, the confluence of people, and the facilities it offers for extensions with but one expensive architectural elevation.

On the whole, it appears that, with a preponderance of testimony adverse to the system of management by Trustees, the Committee have resolved upon continuing it; that, while an unpaid governing body is generally condemned, they have virtually sanctioned it; that, although primarily appointed in consequence of the recent picture-cleaning, and although all witnesses unconnected with the Gallery object to this, as uncalled for or injurious, they have abstained from recording a disapproval of such proceedings. While, therefore, we feel grateful to them for their painstaking investigation of the subject, we trust that, in deciding upon a plan for maintaining a collection of pictures worthy of the age and nation, Government will found its measures upon no narrow views or foregone conclusions.

ART. VI. — 1. *Lorenzo Benoni; or Passages in the Life of an Italian.* Edinburgh and London: 1853. 1 vol. 8vo.

2. *Castellamonte; an Autobiographical Sketch illustrative of Italian Life during the Insurrection of* 1831. 2 vols. post 8vo. London: 1854.

THE only resemblance between these two books lies in their subject. The scenes and the heroes of both are Italian, and both treat of the abortive insurrections which took place in several of the Italian provinces, in consequence of the excitement arising out of the French Revolution of July 1830. Here all similarity ends. Castellamonte is one of the most discreditable specimens of book-making which has ever come under our notice. The popularity of 'Lorenzo Benoni' seems to have stimulated the writer to take up his pen; and though he had little to say — and that little was not worth saying, and is not particularly well said, — he has contrived, by trivial personalities, by tedious verbiage, by irrelevant episodes, by tawdry declamation, to spin it out into two worthless, wearisome, and disappointing volumes. How much of pure fiction, and how much of romantic exaggeration he has allowed himself to mingle with the substratum of fact, we have no means of detecting. Probably the alloy is considerable; but its precise amount it is not important to ascertain. Whether the author was, or was not, as he represents himself, the centre of the whole drama, the soul of the entire plot, the moving spirit of the Revolution, the leader in every skirmish, the hero of every adventure, — is a matter of infinitely small account. The only thing of moment — and this is conveyed faithfully enough — is the picture of mingled frivolity, imbecility, and cowardice, — of victory by accident, of resistance without purpose, of surrender without a struggle — which has been displayed time after time by nearly all the political movements in that unfortunate country.

Castellamonte — we will not betray the incognito which the Author has assumed, and will do well to maintain — is a native of Parma who has apparently completed his academic course, but still mixes a good deal with the students of the University, and enjoys considerable influence over his young associates. It does not appear that the Parmese had much to complain of, either in the way of oppression or taxation. They were, of course, like most continental people, interdicted from political action and discussion; their sovereign, Marie Louise, was a woman whom it was impossible to respect, as she was both profligate and

silly, and her Ministers were bigoted and feeble: but her rule was mild, her subjects generally comfortable and well-to-do, and every one seems to have been allowed to enjoy life in his own way with little interference. But the easy and brilliant success of the outbreak at Paris had infected the exciteable and hot-headed youths of Italy; the standing grievance of the Peninsula—that which has roused and united all classes since the days of Machiavelli—the domination of the Austrians, was then ready to serve as a rallying-point and a war-cry; and the popular mind was in an unusual state of fermentation, which any accident might ripen into a serious crisis. At this conjuncture a favourite Professor is dismissed from his post for some incautious expressions of sympathy with French heroism, and an obnoxious advocate—a pet enemy of Castellamonte—is appointed to succeed him. The students are in a state of noble indignation: they resolve upon a riot in precisely the same temper, half rage, half frolic, in which schoolboys resolve on a barring-out; and Castellamonte is to head them. A friend brings him a magnificent dagger with much farcical mystery: he flourishes the weapon with sundry patriotic apostrophes, and, awkwardly enough, contrives to stab himself in the leg. While confined to the sofa by his accident, a Carbonaro acquaintance visits him, confides to him that a serious *émeute* is in contemplation, which their boyish row may mar, and persuades him to soothe down his fellow-students into mere passive resistance. This is done: but the Government, anxious to remove so turbulent a lad during a period of excitement, issues a warrant for his arrest; but, at the same time, true to its hatred of disturbance and aversion from severity, sends him private warning to abscond. This, however, he conceives it beneath his dignity to do; so he puts on the hero, steels himself against the tears and entreaties of his friends, and resolves to be the proto-martyr to his country's cause—the Curtius of the Parmesan Republic. He is therefore politely visited at night, requested to dress himself, and marched off, along with half-a-dozen of his fellow-rioters, to a mountain-fortress, where they remain in tolerably comfortable durance for three weeks, amusing themselves with various boyish pranks, which their gaoler tolerates with singular good-humour. Meantime the Revolution has taken place at Parma,—that is to say, symptoms of discontent having shown themselves, the troops were kept under arms day and night till they were tired, when a mob collected, surrounded them, mingled among them, fraternised with them, disarmed them (nothing loth, apparently), and organised a National Guard. Marie Louise and her most obnoxious ministers retired secretly and unmolested; and the

change of government was completed without a gun having been fired, or a drop of blood shed. The authorities succumbed without resistance, by way of setting a good example to the insurgents when their turn came round,—an example they admired too much not to imitate.

The victory thus gained, no one seemed to have the least idea what was to be done with it, or why they had desired it. A provisional government was organised, the members of which were principally occupied in throwing cold water on the popular enthusiasm. The prisoners were liberated and joined the insurgent leaders, who seem to have been composed in about equal proportions of boys fresh from Brutus and Timoleon, and of rakes and reprobates fresh from exile or from prison, foolish fanatics, and malignant *mauvais sujets*. The government and the people both cradled themselves in the delusion that there was no danger from the Austrians, inasmuch as the French had proclaimed the doctrine of non-intervention: no steps were taken to ascertain what real ground there might be for their fancied security; no provision was made for defence; no efforts made to obtain powerful alliances for protection in case of the worst. It was unusually fine weather, and every one was contented to slumber and to feast. There appears to have been little order, and no subordination. Any one who was bold and active enough might command; any one who was meek and ductile enough might obey. A sort of irregular expedition set out against Fiorenzuola, where it met some Austrian troops, and was routed, after a smart skirmish. Still the provisional government chose to assume that Austria intended to be as idle and passive as themselves; but some of the insurgents, by way of securing good treatment to such of their friends as had been made prisoners, carried off the Bishop of Guastalla (a former lover of Marie Louise) as a hostage. This seems to have been the great feat of the 'Revolution.' Meanwhile, the Austrians were collecting an overpowering force, and as soon as it was ready, marched against Parma. The provisional government had full notice of its approach, but made no arrangements either for resistance or surrender. Its members sat at their Council Board burning papers that might 'compromise' them, and getting the Palace into order for their Sovereign, that she might not find a single chair out of its place. According to Castellamonte, no guard was even appointed to the gate of the city (an open one of iron lattice-work), and he himself, therefore, assumed the command of this important post, and established himself there with a few volunteer friends—'sending for wine 'and refreshments to a neighbouring tavern'—to make head

against seven thousand Austrian troops. The troops appeared, and seem to have behaved with commendable forbearance, waiting till the spirit of bravado, which had taken possession of the youthful band, should have evaporated. After a short delay, the anxiety of the working people and market-gardeners, inside and outside of the walls, to proceed to their morning avocations prevailed; the gates were thrown open, and the white uniforms of the *Tedeschi*, with the Grand Duchess behind them, took quiet possession of the place.

Thus ended the Parma 'Revolution;' one of the most wretched and ludicrous farces ever enacted on the political stage. It was a perfect caricature of Revolutions, and one that would be wholly unworthy of notice, except as displaying in unusually vivid colours that utter childishness of proceeding, feebleness of character, and absence of any definite object or steady purpose, which distinguished most of the Italian patriotic movements a quarter of a century ago; and which, were it the last act of their history, might well make us despair of their future, and reserve our sympathy for a nobler people, and a more hopeful cause.

'Lorenzo Benoni' is a work of an altogether different stamp. Its tone is far more serious and manly, its *dramatis personæ* are of a far higher order, and its literary merit is incomparably superior. Indeed, in this, as in other respects, it is a very remarkable production, and, if the unaided work of a foreigner, is unrivalled for easy elegance and idiomatic accuracy of style. The spirit which pervades is singularly earnest and yet gentle, reminding us much of Silvio Pellico, while exempt from his almost feminine softness; the love of liberty, which breathes through every page, is of a rational and noble sort; and whatever enthusiasm may be traced in it is of so subdued and genuine a character, so utterly free from the bombast and inflation which so generally makes us turn away in disgust from the writings of most Italian patriots, that even our cold English temperaments can meet it with unchilled sympathy. The author when very young was concerned in the inchoate conspiracy (for it was never more than an *ébauche*) which was attempted in the Sardinian States in 1831, was obliged to fly, and has remained ever since an exile, maintaining a high character, and earning an honest and laborious independence; his brother was thrown into prison, and, we believe, died there by his own hand, fearing lest his fortitude might give way under suffering and torture, and he might thus be betrayed into divulging the names and secrets of his fellow-conspirators; and some of his associates in the unfortunate attempt—one espe-

cially, here spoken of under the name of Fantasio,—have since attained a European reputation. The narrative is strictly autobiographical; the writer briefly sketches his childhood, depicts the training at school and university to which the youth of the middle and upper classes in Piedmont were subjected twenty years ago, the proceedings and temper of the government which laid the foundation for the universal and well-founded discontent which then prevailed, the motives and commencements of the wild project for bringing about a better state of things, in which so many noble spirits were engaged and so many valuable lives were sacrificed, and the final discovery and ruin which involved them all. Their hopes, their wrongs, their failures, are all narrated in simple and unexaggerated language, with sadness, indeed, but without bitterness; and the delineation might teach some salutary lessons to the oppressive and retrogressive Italian governments of to-day,—if those perverse and demented governments could learn from any thing,—and can scarcely fail to suggest some interesting reflections to every reader.

Our author received his education at the public school, and afterwards at the University of Genoa. The first of these establishments seems to have an external resemblance to analogous seminaries in our own country, but it was, if possible, more completely in the hands of the clergy, the supervision exercised over the pupils was far more minute and vexatious, and the spirit prevalent among the boys was wholly different. Both in England and Sardinia the ancient classical writers form one of the leading subjects of study in a public school; but in England, the sympathy with freedom, and the hatred of despotism, which a boy imbibes from the great writers of Greece and Rome, harmonise with the political sentiments of the community into which he is about to enter. But the result was very different when the Sardinian government sought to mould their children into the docile, submissive, and uninterested subjects of a despotic rule, by feeding them on Plutarch, Livy, and the Philippics of Demosthenes, and making them drink in Republicanism with their mother's milk. Doomed as soon as they become men to take no interest and make no inquiries into affairs of State, they were taught while boys to look up with the most fervent admiration to those ancient warriors, senators, and statesmen, who deemed that the country held the first claim upon our services, that patriotism was the only absolutely essential virtue, that to be neutral in civil strife was a mortal crime, and that *idem velle et idem nolle de republicâ* was a closer bond of union than any family or private tie. Intended for unmurmuring slaves, and unquestioning believers 'in the right divine of kings to govern

'wrong,' they were fostered for this pre-ordered destiny by the biographies of the great king-killers and emancipators of old, by eulogistic lives of Leonidas and Epaminondas, Harmodius and Aristogiton.

'Strange but true. Public education in Piedmont — the part of all Italy, perhaps, most despotically governed at that time — was entirely republican. The history of Greece and Rome, the only thing taught us with any care at school, was in truth, according to the light in which it was placed, little else than a constant libel upon monarchy, and a panegyric upon the democratic form of government. The decline of Athens and of Sparta, happy and flourishing as long as they remained republics, dated from the day which gave power into a single hand. Rome dated her greatness and power from the moment she expelled the Tarquins; and the great republic which had conquered the world faded under the hands of the Cæsars, failed to defend its conquests, allowed inroads, and at last vanished. Our indignation against tyrants, and our enthusiasm even for their assassins, seemed to be purposely excited. The subjects given us for our themes in the classes were ever in this range of ideas. Sometimes we were to hurl the thunder of our Latin eloquence upon Cæsar, about to pass the Rubicon; and to prove, in an oration in three parts, with exordium and peroration, that it was the act of an unnatural son to smother the republic, his mother. At others, Brutus, both the elder and the younger, Mutius Scævola, Cato, &c., were to be deified in poetry. Thus, from our most tender years we were inspired with ideas and feelings quite opposed to those we ought to have brought into real life, and with a blind enthusiasm for actions and virtues, the imitation of which would be condemned and punished as a crime by the society in which we were to live. Now, was not this absurd? was it not wantonly sowing danger to be reaped in after life?' (P. 60.)

The sort of proceedings by which the Sardinian government of those days contrived to exasperate, while endeavouring to hush, the spirit of its subjects, is well shown in the University regulations, as described by Lorenzo Benoni in his sixteenth chapter. The students having been mainly concerned in the short-lived Revolution of 1821, the Academical Institutions both at Turin and Genoa were closed by order of the government. But an interdict of this sort which closed every liberal profession against the whole rising generation, could not of course be long entertained, and after a considerable interval, the Universities were re-opened, but under regulations designed 'first, to have few students, and secondly, to make those few as 'miserable as possible.'

'To attain the former point, they created two classes of students; those whose parents could prove the possession of a certain amount of landed property, and those whose parents could not. Again, they

created two distinct modes of examination, one for students of the first class, the other for students of the second. The ordeal appointed for the latter was purposely fraught with such a complication of difficulties, with respect both to the extent of matter comprised in the examination, and to the number of votes required to pass, as to deter the most self-confident from facing it. This amounted to neither more nor less than an ingeniously disguised mode of excluding from the liberal professions an entire class of citizens.'

In addition to these impediments, a number of certificates were required for every student before he could be allowed to matriculate; to wit:—

'1. Certificate of birth and baptism.
'2. Do. of my having been vaccinated or had the small-pox.
'3. Do. of my having followed two years' study in philosophy, and of having passed the examinations thereunto appertaining.
'4. Do. of good conduct from my parish priest.
'5. Do. of having attended at my parish church on all church and feast days for the last six months.
'6. Do. of having confessed each month during the same period.
'7. Do. of having confessed and taken the sacrament duly as required by the precept for Easter, at that solemnity last preceding.
'8. Do. that my father and mother 'possessed landed property sufficient to afford each son a portion equal to the amount required by the rule to which I have already referred.
'9. And last, a certificate from the police that I (then a boy of twelve years of age) had taken no part in the constitutional movement of 1821.'

Of course, certificates of this number and kind were not to be obtained without a considerable amount of necessary lying, which seems to have been pretty equally divided between the students themselves, and their more good-natured and sensible confessors. When, at length, they had all been furnished, and the requisite formalities gone through, it might have been hoped that all trouble was at an end. Not so, however; the student, it is true, was supplied with an 'Admittatur,' but this was *valid for three months only:* 'At the end of that time,' said the Secretary, 'you must bring me back this, signed by all the 'professors, along with a certificate from your confessor, and 'one from the rector of your parish, attesting that you have 'previously fulfilled your religious duties; and then we shall 'see whether we can give you another!' It may well be supposed that a system of this sort, rigidly carried out, regarding obedience, regularity, and submissiveness as everything, and

industry, talent, and merit as nothing, was admirably calculated to make slaves of the mean, hypocrites of the timid and crafty, and rebels and conspirators of every youth possessed of one spark of independent spirit, one noble and generous aspiration, or the slightest consciousness of high endowment. And in this wretched and degrading line of action, combined with the peculiar education we have already noticed as given at the public schools, we may find a sufficient explanation of the fact, that in nearly all Italian insurrections the students of the several Universities are among the most prominent actors, if not the prime movers and the chosen leaders.

The government of the State was precisely analogous to the government of the University. It was a compound of the two most odious and insolent forms of administration — the military and the ecclesiastical. It was at once stupid, provocative, and oppressive. Soldiers and priests swarmed everywhere. Priests made themselves the spies of the police, and the police carried into effect the orders of a tyrannical and bigoted priesthood. The civil authorities had comparatively little power; the regular legal tribunals could neither enforce their own decrees, nor ensure respect for their decisions, for the monarch interfered with them and revised them at his capricious pleasure. There was no liberty of action, and no liberty of speech. A public press scarcely existed. The only newspapers in all Piedmont were three official gazettes — the most dull, dreary, and meagre affairs imaginable. Informers flourished in every grade and in every circle of society. No good foreign books were allowed to pass the custom-house, and no decent ones of native manufacture could pass the censorship. An utter stagnation and suppression of all intellectual life was the thing aimed at and nearly attained. Those who acquiesced in such a state of things had all manliness crushed out of them. Those who rebelled against it became of necessity conspirators, insurgents, exiles, prisoners, and victims.

Of course a government like this could not exist without benumbing much besides literature and political excitement. Commerce cannot flourish without freedom; the legal profession cannot thrive where law is not respected, and where the highest courts of judicature are overridden by the arbitrary will of the monarch or the monarch's favourites; even medicine requires something like liberty and the power of progress to become either a dignified, a lucrative, or a scientific calling. Accordingly the saddest feature of 'Lorenzo Benoni' is the impression it gives of the stagnant, monotonous, spiritless, profitless existence to which every one above the condition of a

peasant or an artisan was at that time condemned. In no trade or profession was there an opening for men of energy — a career for men of ambition. Scarcely anything was stirring, scarcely any thing was doing, in any line. Those who entered the army had a bare maintenance — but nothing more. They had nothing to do: so they frittered away their years at ball-rooms, theatres, and *cafés*. Those who embraced the medical profession were nearly as ill off: that line was already over-stocked, and few patients could be procured. Those who entered on a commercial life, like the uncle of our hero, found themselves engaged in a dull routine in which profits were small, and impediments and formalities were many. Those who became lawyers, like Lorenzo and his brother, could get no business: barristers were many; litigants were few — and, what was worse, were poor. So advocates and physicians, also, killed time as they could, — reading little, talking much, — in the streets, at the casino, in small knots and coteries of friends, and with the never-failing resource of a cigar. For literature there was no encouragement, and scanty reward; for if it soared above the meanest mediocrity it became suspected and dangerous, and was far more likely to lead to a loathsome dungeon than to a laurel crown. A universal and compelled idleness seemed to be the law of the land; a life of usefulness and frivolity was enforced upon every one; and energy, talent, or spirit, was thus made a curse to its possessor, and a peril to the State.

This condition of society gives an ample explanation of three phenomena which, without a knowledge of it, we might not so readily have understood — namely, the perpetual plots of which all Italian governments, whether native or foreign, have been the object; the extreme youth of the insurgents and conspirators; and the fact that they so often belong to the better and nobler spirits of the nation. Can we wonder that a Government insane enough thus laboriously, as it were, to dam up every legitimate channel in which the energies of its people might have innocently and beneficially expended themselves, should find that it had driven them, by an irresistible necessity, into conspiracy and rebellion? Can we wonder at the fierce and implacable hatred it created in the minds of men who felt that they were born for better things, — that life under such conditions was scarcely worth having, — and that a sway which thus killed, or crushed, or reduced to the inaction of despair whatever was good, and noble, and capable within their souls, was a public nuisance — an enemy of the human race, war against which partook of the holiness of a crusade? It is

difficult, in spite of all their vanities and follies, not to entertain a deep respect for men who, in such a climate, under such a sun, with a life of indolent and sensual pleasure within their reach, with the *dolce far niente* forced upon them, inculcated as a duty, compelled as a necessity, could yet turn away, loathing and unsatisfied, from the opera, the corso, and the gaming-table — from the convivial assembly and the midnight orgy — and say, 'No! life was not given us to be so wasted, and we will NOT so waste it; life has higher objects, more solemn obligations, more imperious calls; life so stagnant, so drawling, so slavish, is a gift we do not care to keep; and if we cannot bring about a better state of things, we may as well, at least, persist in the attempt to do so.'

It is obvious that it would be precisely the best, the purest, the most aspiring — if not the most wise and sober — who would feel thus, and who, under such a government as then weighed upon Italy, would be most sure to be found in the ranks of the conspirators. And accordingly, both then and since, the higher class of Italian patriots, whether in exile or in prison, have been honourably distinguished from those of almost every other land. We have known many of every class and shade of opinion, and from every part of Italy, and little as our admiration is excited for revolutionists in general, we cannot refrain from bearing willing testimony to the lofty *morale* and fine intellect which is the usual characteristic of the men of whom we speak. They are not disappointed intriguers. They are not mere vain and shallow egotists. They are not selfish disturbers of the public peace in the hope of something advantageous to themselves turning up in the confusion. They are not mere turbulent demagogues or vapid declaimers. On the contrary, they are for the most part earnest, sincere, and elevated characters — many of them, like Poerio and Settembrini, displaying a mixture of stoicism and tenderness which is especially attractive. They are often men of excellent education, deep reading, statesman-like capacity, high and brilliant conversational powers, and singular beauty, fidelity, and strength in their domestic affections, — the whole tinged with that pathetic and indescribable sadness inseparable from noble minds in a world and in an age like this. Such were some whom we knew in Greece during the revolutionary war. Such is Manin, the ex-dictator of Venice. Such were the two victims of Neapolitan barbarism whom we have just named. Such is the author of the volume before us; and such, by the admission of both friends and foes, is the remarkable man of whom, under the name of Fantasio, a very truthful likeness is here drawn,

and regarding whom, as we have often had to speak of him with freedom and severity, we are glad to have an opportunity of stating our conviction that—mistaken, fanatical, and mischievous as we conceive him to have been—Europe holds few men of finer intellect, of more pure and spotless moral character, or of a richer, tenderer, more genial nature. Of much that we see in him to blame and to deplore, the autobiography of Lorenzo Benoni affords an explanation. We see the despicable, fatal, grinding nature of the despotism which irritated him and drove him forth; we see his most intimate friends exiled, imprisoned, or put to death by the Piedmontese monarch, and we can scarcely wonder that his distrust of that royal House (changed and constitutional as it has since become) should be insurmountable; we see the nature of the man—stern, resolute, concentrated, enthusiastic, and pertinacious, and we cease to be surprised that love of 'the people' and hatred of the Austrians should have blinded him to the defects of the one and to the strength of the other.

Again. The volume before us explains clearly enough a circumstance which we have always deplored, and which has largely contributed to inspire distrust of all patriotic movement in Italy, we mean the extreme youth of most of the actors, and originators in them. Not only is it, there as elsewhere, that the young alone refuse to see difficulties, and 'to count the cost,' that they alone possess the sanguine imagination which can hope for victory, and the carelessness of danger which stakes life cheerfully and lightly in a noble cause; but, under such governments as that of Piedmont was, and those of all the other Italian States still are, the young alone retain the elasticity of spirit to dare any thing or to act at all. If they dawdle out their years under that leaden despotism till middle life, all energy has become extinct within them, all aspirations after a noble career have died away, an existence of pleasure has killed the capacity for exertion and for sacrifice, a long course of acquiescence has made the yoke endurable, and degraded the soul into harmony with its degraded lot. Those who have danced, and dreamed, and slumbered away the fifteen best years of life cannot at the age of five-and-thirty cast off their indolence and arouse themselves to an enterprise of danger and privation; if they have accepted their fate so long they will not begin to quarrel with it then; if the government has succeeded in keeping them quiet till then it has done its work effectually so far as they are concerned. Those accustomed to lounge, and smoke, and intrigue, and frequent *cafés* till they have reached maturity, are little likely then to gird on their armour for a

deadly struggle and a distant prize. They may be the men to turn the victory to profit when once gained, scarcely the men either to organise the army or to begin the strife.

There is another reason, too, why the young will always be the main movers in Italian revolutions. They are less likely than their elders to discern, and less willing to believe, what a slow process national regeneration must ever be, and what a broad and deep foundation must be laid for any change of system which is to be firm and lasting. There is one of the *dramatis personæ* in the book we are reviewing, a merchant-uncle of the author, who endeavoured to impress upon him this unpalatable wisdom, but in vain:—

'You see things (he would sometimes say) not as they are, but as your imagination paints them. Pretty nearly every one, I allow, despises and detests the government, but it does not thrive the less for that. Analyse society, and tell me where you see those manly virtues, that spirit of self-sacrifice, which regenerate nations. Look at our nobles, for instance. The old men sulk at the government; do you think it is from love of liberty? Pshaw! they do so because they would like to hold the reins themselves. The young ones think only of their horses and their mistresses. The middle class is eaten up by selfishness; each individual man is engrossed by his office, his counting-house, or his clients. Number One is their god . . . . The people are ignorant and superstitious (not by their own fault, to be sure, but they are so), and, therefore, the slaves of the priests, those born enemies of progress. They hear mass in the morning, and get drunk at night, and think, notwithstanding, that all is right with God and their conscience. What then remains? A certain number of young men, crammed with Greek and Roman History; enthusiastic, generous—I do not deny it—but perfectly incapable of doing anything but getting themselves hanged. Absence of virtue, my dear boy, is synonymous with impotence. The mass is rotten at the core, I tell you. Suppose for a moment that you could make *tabula rasa* of that which exists, what could you build with such materials? An edifice which rests upon decayed rafters is faulty in its foundations, and will crumble with the first shock. . . . .

'Progress comes of itself: Providence wills it so. There are in the moral world, as well as in the physical, mysterious principles at work unknown to ourselves, and even in spite of ourselves. Thanks to this latent working, things are better to-day than they were a hundred, or even fifty years ago; and fifty years hence, you who are young will see still further improvement. One must take present evil with patience, and give time leisure to do its work. Let each in his humble sphere try to become better, and render better those around him. There, and only there, lies the corner stone of our future regeneration. As for me, my dear friend, when in the first shop into which I may happen to go, I am only asked the fair price or thereabouts of the article I go to buy, I shall consider my country

to have made a more important conquest than if it had given itself all the institutions of Sparta and of Athens into the bargain.' (p. 146.)

The progress which this sagacious old man spoke of as so gradual and distant has come already. It is impossible to compare the events of 1821 and 1831 with those of 1848 without feeling that the progress has been great and signal. The feeble, abortive, purposeless movements of the earlier periods—the wildness or vagueness of their objects, the ludicrous inadequacy of their means, the want of organisation in preparing for the strife, the panic terror in the day of battle,—disappointed, and almost extinguished, European sympathy with Italian aspirations after emancipation and independence. The unexpected and sustained energy displayed at the latter date—the extent and comparative unanimity of the movement—the pertinacity of the struggle in many quarters—the obstinate resistance of the Sicilians—the gallant exploits of the five days in Milan—the energetic but hopeless defence of Rome against a superior French force—the prolonged, noble, and nearly successful maintenance of Venice, which wrung fair and clement terms even from the Austrians—served to prove, with a clear lustre which even subsequent follies and incapacities could not obscure, that in the interval which had elapsed the Italians had learned both to organise, to govern, and to fight. They made many blunders, betrayed many weaknesses, manifested deplorable immaturity, showed that they had yet much to learn and much to cure. Some held aloof when they ought to have joined cordially and unselfishly, because matters were not conducted precisely as they wished. Some quarrelled over the division of the spoil before the victory was fully won. Some remembered private wrongs, some dreamed idle visions, some loved their crotchets better than their country. There was the usual admixture of base alloy, of human infirmity, of permitted crime. But, after every deduction is made, the revolutions of 1831 will always bear to those of 1848 the same relation which the transient effervescence of the boy bears to the earnest enterprise of the serious and mature man.

The same comparison of the two epochs suggests another most encouraging phenomenon, which Mazzini and his followers would do well to lay to heart. It is singular that in perusing this autobiography of his early friend, exiled for participation in the same conspiracy with himself, he should not have been forcibly struck, as we have been, with the contrast between Piedmont *then* and Piedmont *now*, and should not have asked himself the question: 'Whose policy has brought about this blessed 'change—his own republicanism or the constitutionalism of his

'rival patriots?' Twenty years ago, Piedmont was such as we have described it; languishing under a stupid and leaden despotism; the press fettered; thought proscribed; literature extinguished; liberty at the mercy of every *gendarme* and of every priest; the very souls of men crushed out of them. *Now*, Piedmont has a constitutional monarch and a parliamentary government; law is everywhere paramount; commerce is reviving; life is being infused into every grade of society; education has received a new form and a mighty stimulus, and will make the rising generation very different from the expiring one; the priesthood is shackled, and the press is free; and Mazzini's own city of Genoa is, in nearly all points, in possession of as much individual liberty as Brussels or Geneva. If all Italy were as the Sardinian kingdom now is, what more could Mazzini himself desire? And what has made the Sardinian dominions thus free, thus enviable, thus the very reverse of what they were when Mazzini first raised the standard of revolt? What, but the labours of those 'moderate men,' those very constitutionalists, with whom he could never act, and whose principles and talents he considers alike inadequate to the grand work of national regeneration? We do not here enter into the question whether a republic or a monarchy will be the fittest government for the Peninsula—whether it would be best for Italy to form one great country or a congeries of small states, each with its own idiomatic character. We know Mazzini's argument, that to effect so mighty a work as national emancipation you need one of two things, either a great man or a great principle; that the niche of the first is empty, and that Victor Emanuel cannot fill the vacancy; and that therefore it is only by proclaiming the second, by raising the standard of 'Italy one and indivisible,' that you can ever achieve her independence or regeneration. But we ask him to contrast what he has *actually effected* for his countrymen with the *faits accomplis* of Azeglio. Mazzini has taught them to conspire; and admirable conspirators we allow he has made of them—secret, sagacious, astutely organised, and faithful to the death. He has set them an example by his gallant and heroic defence of Rome, and has infused into them much of his own elastic and indomitable spirit. He has provided a perennial crop of ever-ready martyrs, whose number and devotion, we confess, fill us with wonder and respect. But as yet he has done no more. He has been unable to consolidate anything. If he were to die to-morrow, he would have left no monuments of a life of toil and daring save barren scaffolds and unfruitful graves. But the party whose rival and opponent he has always been has at least

succeeded in establishing one worthy State in that deplorable land, one fresh oasis in that moral desert, one breathing spot in that suffocating prison-house, where freedom can take root and germinate and bear fruit for future years. In the difficult field of parliamentary government, where so many reputations have been beaten down, the Piedmontese have won their spurs: the constitutionalists — wholly inexperienced in the nice managements of party warfare; beset by the revolutionary faction on the one hand and the reactionary faction on the other; at strife with the court of Rome, and waging, in behalf of their infant light, an internecine war with every clerical and official bigot who had a vested interest in darkness; watched, too, all the while, along their frontier by a vigilant, jealous, and malignant foe, ever on the alert to profit by every blunder, and to take advantage of the smallest opening for interference — have yet steered through the narrow channel, navigated the unwonted waters, and shunned the sunken rocks, with a degree of skill, nerve, patience, and sagacity which hitherto no Southern nation has attained. In the preservation and the prosperity of the free institutions of Piedmont lie, we believe, the future hopes of Italy. As they become firmly established and widely developed, as they bear their certain fruit and manifest their inestimable value, the other nations and other sovereigns of the Peninsula will begin to envy and desire to learn. The people will see close by their side and in actual working all the solid benefits they desire to gain, and they will tame down their wild dreams of a republic to similar institutions similarly won. They will have ever before their eyes a goading and encouraging example of what men — Italians like themselves — have actually done and are still daily doing. The monarchs will see with wonder, with mistrust at first, with conviction at last, a fellow-sovereign more powerful with his parliament than they with their autocracy; more prosperous and wealthy with his unfettered industry, than they with all their ingenious fences, bounties, and restrictions; stronger, because reigning over contented citizens, than they, while trampling merely upon crushed and cursing slaves; safer in the sincere love and loyalty of his emancipated people than they in all their costly panoply of foreign patrons and mercenary guards. The contrast cannot be without its fruit. Truth, when blended with self-interest will percolate even to the dull chambers of a Bomba's brain; and the first Italian state that follows the example of Sardinia will make it imperative on all the rest to follow in its wake, and impossible for even Austria to forbid the progress.

One thing only can destroy, or indefinitely postpone, the

realisation of this beckoning prospect; and that is, a renewal of those wretched insurrectionary movements which will frighten back the timid despots of Italy into their old stupid and brutal cruelties, and give Austria the pretext she desires for further interference. Circumstances are just now arising which may tempt some misguided patriots into a commission of such follies. We trust they may take warning by the past, resist all inducements, and abjure all such mischievous and hopeless projects, or they will mar their country's prospects for long years to come. Austria seems as if she were about to break with her old accomplice and ally in despotism, and to fight side by side with England and France in resenting injustice and repressing the ambition of the great permanent enemy of popular rights. If she does so cordially and loyally, we can, of course, look with no favour on movements, however natural or inherently just, which are directed against a power whose interests for the time are united with our own; while, on the other hand, out of this new and strange set of European alliances, may arise much ultimate hope for Italian freedom, if Italians will only wait and watch. Austria's strength to oppress and crush the liberties of her own subjects or of other States cannot fail to be considerably impaired by the severance of her connexion with the Northern Autocrat; while, at the same time, she will feel that England, though never a favourer of revolutionary designs, can have no cordial friendship or sympathy with her so long as her name is known only as the narrow and merciless foe, not only of insurgents and democrats, but of the sober, moderate, rational votaries of freedom. Her hands are too bloody, and her system of government too narrow and severe, to obtain any countenance from us. If, therefore, having exchanged the alliance of her Russian patron for that of a free and justice-loving country, she wishes the amity of her new companion to be genuine and lasting, she will feel that she must henceforth abstain from those acts of barbarous oppression and of systematic faithlessness which make English blood boil and English flesh creep, and must purchase our oblivion of the past and our attachment for the future, by at least some decided approaches towards a more lenient rule and a more evenhanded justice, both in Italy and Hungary. The good offices of this country will not be wanting to suggest to her the wisdom of thus diverging into a new, and safer, and more reputable path. But how could we urge such a change of policy, if Austria could point in answer to renewed outbreaks and ceaseless conspiracies as proofs that any mitigation of severity was both unmerited and unsafe? Matters, we firmly

believe, are ripening for a better day, if neither wild ambition nor insane impatience are permitted to step in and interrupt a process which to them seems inadequate and slow. Austria allied with England will at all events be a gentler tyrant and a less relentless foe than Austria bound to Russia by the ties of a common hatred against freedom and enlightenment; — and this for the present must suffice.

---

Art. VII.—1. *Copies of the Lord Chancellor's Letters to the Judges on the Criminal Law Bills of the last Session, and Copies of their Answers thereto.* Ordered to be printed, 9th February, 1854.

2. *A Letter to the Lord Chancellor, containing Observations on the Answers of the Judges to the Lord Chancellor's Letter.* By Charles Sprengel Greaves, Esq., Q.C., and James John Lonsdale, Esq., Barrister-at-Law (Secretary to the Common Law Commission). London: 1854.

It is now upwards of twenty years since the Government of Lord Grey issued the first Commission for reducing the Criminal Law into a Code or Digest. The labours of the learned Commissioners produced valuable reports upon the subject of Codification in general, and two Digests—one of Crimes and Punishments, the other of Criminal Procedure. A Bill, founded on the first of these, was in 1845 presented to the House of Lords by Lord Brougham (he having been Chancellor when the Commission issued), and it was referred back, on Lord Chancellor Lyndhurst's suggestion, to the Commissioners with others added to their number. After thus undergoing a full revision by fresh minds, it was again introduced, and in 1848, and 1849, it was read a second time, and referred to Select Committees of their Lordships' House. The Commission having, by an oversight, been allowed to expire, Lord Derby's Government again took up the subject; it was thought by the friends of the Digest expedient to pass it in chapters, beginning with the most important and difficult of all the heads,—offences against the person; and their Chancellor, Lord St. Leonards, though averse to Codification, very candidly and diligently took charge of the measure. He was succeeded by Lord Cranworth, who engaged to bring in the other Bills, as that for offences against property, &c. The Bill for offences against the person was read a second time, referred to a Select

Committee of the Law Lords and others, closely and elaborately scrutinised, with the aid of the draughtsmen, Messrs. Greaves and Lonsdale, and reported to the House, by whom it was postponed till next Session in consequence of one or two important articles which were directed to be further considered.

The Digest thus matured, had been prepared, revised, and approved by some of the most eminent lawyers of the country; Mr. Justice Wightman, Sir E. Ryan, Mr. Starkie, Professor Amos, Messrs. R. V. Richards, Jardine, B. Ker, J. Austin, as well as Messrs. Greaves and Lonsdale; by successive Chancellors, Lords Lyndhurst, Brougham, St. Leonards, Cranworth; Lords Chief Justice Denman and Campbell. The House of Lords having repeatedly decided that the Law should be digested, this was hardly a question so far open as to be fit for the decision of the Judges, though their observations upon the details of the Digest were most properly called for, and deserved when offered the most respectful consideration. Nevertheless the names we have cited afford some *primâ facie* presumption at least that many of the errors of detail pointed out by the Judges must have appeared such in their eyes from their having had no time to make a more careful examination of the particulars. But the principle of the measure had been repeatedly sanctioned by the Lords; and as Messrs. Greaves and Lonsdale justly observe, 'every Government for the last twenty years had considered it as a settled 'question that a Digest not only of the written but of the unwritten Criminal Law was expedient and practicable.' But Lord Cranworth, in his anxiety to do what was right, unfortunately fell into the mistake of submitting not only the detail but the principle to those learned persons, and submitting it in a form that almost called forth their condemnation; because he assumed that the unfinished work of the Commissioners and the Committee was as perfect an attempt at Codification as it was possible to make; although, by his own admission, some of the most important definitions were left imperfect and reserved for further consideration. It was not more fair towards the Judges than towards the measure, thus to require an opinion which they manifestly were reluctant to give, on a subject which their judicial duties left them no leisure fully to examine. We may add, that their habits were almost certain to give their minds a bias on the question.

We do not now allude to the 'prejudice' engendered by 'the 'professional habits of many years,' which Mr. Justice Coleridge fears may have influenced his judgment, but we refer to the direct interest which each of the Judges must have in preserving the law, as near as conveniently may be, in its present state.

As a body, the Judges are upright, honourable, and zealous magistrates, but they are men still; and they must be something more or less than men, if they can contemplate, without serious dissatisfaction, a comprehensive change in the law which, however beneficial it may be to the public, must inevitably impose upon them considerable additional labour for some years to come. The *viginti annorum lucubrationes* have made them familiar with the law which they so ably and so uprightly administer; and there is no task so repulsive as that of unlearning in old age the lessons of our youth. Men, when they come to the time of life of the Judges, are naturally desirous of ease. The even tenour of their way must not be disturbed. They cannot study novel inventions. New-fangled doctrines are an abomination to them. These are sentiments so universally prevalent, that it is idle to expect that the Judges should not entertain them. At three-score years and ten, why should a Lord Chief Baron have to master the thousand sections of a new Code? He has done without one hitherto, and he hopes that he has done justice. He can administer the old law without much trouble. Why, then, should he be required to learn a new law, 'in order,' as Mr. Baron Alderson expresses it, 'to 'make an empty boast of possessing a Criminal Code?'

Feeling as we do the full force of this reasoning, we are not in the least surprised at the answers which the Judges have returned to the letter of the Lord Chancellor. One and all, they are opposed to the change; and it would, indeed, be a miracle if they were not. First, they contend that the Bill submitted to them is founded on 'a totally wrong principle,' inasmuch as it substitutes written rules for the unwritten doctrines of the common law. 'The rules of the common law,' says Mr. Baron Parke, 'are clear and well understood, and they 'have the incalculable advantage of being capable of application 'to new combinations of circumstances perpetually occurring, 'which are decided, when they arise, by inference and analogy 'to them, and upon the principles on which they rest.'—'To 'reduce the statute law into a narrow compass,' says Mr. Justice Talfourd, 'is an object entirely free from objection, and 'which, if accomplished with care, can produce nothing but 'good; but to reduce unwritten law to statute is to discard 'one of the greatest blessings we have for ages enjoyed in *rules* '*capable of flexible application.*'—It certainly requires a very judicial, as contradistinguished from a legislative mind to comprehend the full force of this reasoning. We can understand a Judge using it, for 'rules capable of flexible application' are extremely convenient loop-holes, when ill-considered judgments

are called in question; but the matter assumes a very different complexion when we are considering the interest, not of the Judge, but of the suitor. There is a provoking old maxim even of the common law, that '*misera est servitus ubi jus vagum aut 'incognitum;*'* and a man must be endowed with more than ordinary powers of sophistry, who can satisfactorily maintain that a rule capable of flexible application does not fall within 'the principle' of that maxim. Why, the flexibility of the common law, which is put forward by the Judges as the main argument in opposition to the Code, has all along been regarded by law reformers as the keystone on which the utility of a Code rests. They contend—and most justly—that the rules of the common law are vague and indeterminate; that the reported judgments and the text books of authority contain very few principles; that those principles are often contradictory; that the text writers differ most materially from each other as to what the law is; that many of the decisions of the Judges are based on subtle, useless, fluctuating, or unintelligible distinctions, while others cannot be referred to any principle at all; that the constructive expansion or contraction of rules to meet the supposed exigencies of society is alike dangerous to liberty and subversive of good government; and that it is a grievous evil when, in consequence of the flexibility of the legal principle, the magistrate does not know what law he is bound to administer, or the subject what law he is bound to obey.

The next objection raised by the Judges to the proposed Code rests on the assumption that the Bill submitted to them is so full of inaccuracies and blunders, that if it were to pass in its present shape, the due administration of justice would be seriously compromised. Humorous comments are made upon its clauses, and every variety of criticism, 'from grave to gay, from lively 'to severe,' is brought to bear upon the subject. The most weighty questions of construction, the most trivial questions of grammar, are alternately discussed. Satire, sarcasm, irony, and something akin to petulance, each play their several parts; and almost the only weapons that are sparingly used are accurate facts and logical reasoning. One section is gravely condemned because it 'introduces a new mode of expression, beginning with 'the impersonal—"*It shall be rape*, &c."' Fault is next found with the words 'criminal agency and participation,' first, because participation, 'without the adjunct criminal, is senseless,'

* It was observed in the debates on this matter that the maxim of the Judges seemed to be '*misera est servitus (judicum) ubi jus certum et cognitum.*

and next, because even with it, 'the reader may ask "What '"does criminal participation mean?"' Nay, the very title to the Bill does not escape censure. One reads (says Sir T. N. Talfourd), 'An Act to correct and amend the criminal law of 'England, so *far as relates*,' and pausing at the third line, asks 'what relates?' 'Will the framers of the Bill show their 'fitness to legislate for a people by leaving a verb with nothing 'to govern it?' The learned critic supplies 'it,' and proceeds, 'as it relates.' What renders this last criticism (which, by the way, is wholly erroneous) the more amusing is, that the very form of speech which has so shocked the grammatical taste of the learned Judge, is to be found in the letter of the Lord Chancellor to which he is replying. 'I wish to know,' says Lord Cranworth, 'whether the Judges consider that "the '"bringing the whole criminal law, *so far as relates* to offences, '"into one Statute," would be a beneficial measure.'

Passing on now to the more serious charges against the Bill, we find by the aid of Messrs. Greaves and Lonsdale's temperate and useful commentary, that they are almost, without exception, either founded on errors which the Judges have committed from want of paying sufficient attention to the different clauses, or that they are charges which can only be brought against the Bill on the ground that it too accurately embodies the law as it at present exists. Mr. Baron Alderson furnishes a striking example of the former class of objections, when he puts the following case:—'Suppose a person having received provoca-'tion from J. S., sufficient to make the killing, which would be 'wilful, only manslaughter, kills B. by accident, who has given 'no provocation, it may be difficult to say what, under this act, 'is his crime.' We confess that we cannot discover any difficulty when we read in section 60 (which the learned Baron appears to have passed over), that 'homicide shall be man-'slaughter, although the offender, by mistake or accident, kill 'not the person who offered the provocation, but some other 'person, provided that if the person who offered the provocation 'had been killed, such homicide would have been manslaughter 'within the meaning of the last preceding section.' Another learned Judge commits a similar oversight, when he supposes 'a person wilfully to leave his child exposed to cold, which 'causes its death,' and then asks whether 'he is to be deemed 'to have killed the child; and if so, under which of the sections 'from 51 to 55?' The answer is perfectly plain. He is not to be deemed to have killed the child under any one of those sections, but he is to be deemed to have killed it under section 50, which expressly enacts, that it shall be homicide 'wherever

'any person shall by any means or in any manner whatsoever 'cause the death of another person.'

We can only refer to one more error, but that is a sufficiently remarkable instance, as no less than three Judges have fallen into it. 'Unless I am greatly mistaken,' says Lord Chief Justice Jervis, 'if a man knock another down, doing him no 'bodily harm, he will not, after the passing of this act, be 'liable to prosecution.'—Mr. Baron Parke observes, 'if a man 'attacked another suddenly without any previous threat, and 'struck him down, it is at least doubtful whether he could be 'punished. Section 133 does not include in express terms a 'battery, and there is no section, I believe, that does.'—Mr. Justice Wightman adds, 'that the definition of an assault given 'in section 133, does not include in its terms the case of an 'actual striking or beating.' It would, indeed, be strange if it did; for an assault in law is a mere *attempt* or *offer* to commit a battery, and nothing more. The fact is, that all these eminent men have forgotten the legal distinction between an assault and a battery, and have entirely overlooked section 127 of the Bill, which applies to any person 'who shall maliciously cause any bodily harm, or do any violence to the person of another,' and which, therefore, expressly includes the very cases put by them.

In illustration of the second class of objections,—namely, those which, though levelled at the Bill, are in reality applicable to the law in its present state,—we could, if necessary, cite a whole cloud of examples. One or two instances must, however, suffice; and we know not that we could select any more appropriate than those furnished by Mr. Justice Erle. That learned Judge finds fault with the sections relating to homicide, and he asks with evident dissatisfaction, 'whether the sheriff of a 'wrong county, who executes a capital sentence,' or, 'a person 'who kills an invading enemy, not in battle, is guilty of 'murder?' We fear that these questions must be answered in the affirmative; but if Sir William Erle will turn to the authoritative treatise of Lord Hale, he will find at pages 433 and 497 of the 1st volume, that the defects to which he has alluded have not, as he seems to imagine, been introduced as novelties into the Code, but that they form part and parcel of the existing common law. So, when Mr. Justice Wightman and Mr. Justice Cresswell point out, as the curious result of sections 107 and 118, that, although a man may be transported for life for causing gunpowder to explode with intent to do grievous bodily harm, he can only be transported for seven years if he attempts to murder by similar means,—they, no doubt, draw

attention to a very absurd inconsistency. They are, however, obviously ignorant of the fact, that it is one which obtains in the present law; for while the former crime is a statutable offence by virtue of section 4 of the Act of 9 & 10 Vict. c. 25, the latter is a mere common law misdemeanor punishable by fine and imprisonment.

We have been the more anxious to cite this last example, because, to our minds, it furnishes one of the most cogent arguments in favour of a Code. Had it not been for the Digest, the inconsistency complained of might have remained unnoticed for any conceivable length of time; but by aid of that Digest it has speedily been brought to light. 'From the consolidation of the 'criminal law,' says an able writer, 'the public cannot fail to 'reap this great advantage, that the Digest will enable the judi- 'cious legislator, with comparatively little labour, to detect the 'anomalies and errors of the existing system, and it will thus 'assist him in suggesting from time to time such alterations as 'may constitute real, practical, consistent amendments.'

In commenting on the letters of the Judges, we have been compelled to deal with the 'bulk' of the objections 'by sample.' Enough, however, has, we trust, been said to put the legislature and the country upon their guard, lest they should be misled into the foolish error of assuming that the arguments of wise men must inevitably be wise. Many thousands of pounds have been lavished on the work of digesting the criminal law; and after twenty years of anxious and intense labour, that great undertaking has at length been brought almost to completion. Is it wise, then, to forego, at the last moment, all the incalculable benefits which the public would derive from the Code; not because it is shown to be impracticable, still less because sound law reformers entertain any doubts as to its expediency,—but simply because fourteen not wholly disinterested witnesses have borne testimony against its merit, and have founded their objections on a misunderstanding of the facts, and a misinterpretation of the law?

As we have purposely avoided loading these pages with more than a sample of the commodity we have had to deal with, so we affirm that the bulk answers, generally speaking, to the sample. Indeed, there are some mistakes and oversights so very glaring, that we could not have fairly selected them as instances. Thus Mr. Justice Talfourd treats with the utmost ridicule a definition of 'wounds,' which he says 'must be in- 'tended to anticipate some future discovery in science,' and which yet is supported by a decided case of late occurrence, cited by Messrs. Greaves and Lonsdale (*Reg.* v. *Smith*, 8 C. &

P. 173.), and he complains at great length legally of a new term introduced into criminal law—'excuse;' and grammatically of making the act done excuse, and not the Court or the Crown; but Messrs. Greaves and Lonsdale cite four several chapters of Lord Hale, in which 'excuse' is the subject treated of, and the word is used exactly as the Digest uses it. But we admit that taking such specimens of hardly credible carelessness would be unfair to the body of the Judges' remarks.

We can well imagine the satisfaction with which Sir Samuel Romilly would have perused the opinions of these learned persons against Codification, in defence of which, in his last written production (the grace and ornament of our pages*), he had given an unanswerable statement of his reasons, the result of a whole life's deliberate reflection, and of his own large practical experience also—above all, when he found these Judges proclaiming in terms the inestimable blessing for ages enjoyed by this country of a rule flexible in its application; thus describing the common law as no rule at all.

In truth, the whole question lies in a narrow compass, though it is not often that we find it thus placed by the advocates of one side in a light which leaves no possibility of doubt that they must be in the wrong. The ruler requires his subjects to obey the law, and denounces the severest penalties against an infraction of it. The subject asks what law he is to obey, and professes his willingness to conform as soon as he knows it; but he desires to be informed what is required of him before he acts, in order that he may comply. '"No, indeed," says the ruler, "you shall only know '"it after you have acted, and when you come to be tried. '"The Judge who is to sit upon your case will tell you what '"the law is which you are alleged to have broken." "Then," 'says the subject, "I wish the Judge would let me know before-'"hand, that I may be able to shape my conduct accordingly." '"Beforehand?" rejoins the ruler. "How can that be? The '"Judge himself only knows it when he sees the facts of your '"case before him; and the law is so flexible in his hands, that '"it varies from day to day, and from case to case. It is in '"reality only made when it is wanted for use; it may be altered, '"and mended, and stretched, or contracted, to serve the pur-'"pose in hand, but it is only made when wanted."'

If any fresh proof were required how unsafe the Judges are as guides in legislation, these answers furnish it in ample

* Edinburgh Review, November, 1817, *Bentham's Papers on Codification.*

measure. The same excellent and most learned persons, who would never dream of pronouncing an opinion upon any instrument how unimportant soever—will, bond, bill, memorandum of agreement,—without carefully examining every line and word of it, and comparing its parts together, and after such scrutiny, would, if there was any doubt, only give the inclination of their opinion—have pronounced an unhesitating judgment on many portions of this Digest, without having read the correlative parts, and have thus, as might be expected, fallen into errors quite as glaring as those they hastily imputed to the work on the merits of which they were deciding. Of this we have given some instances by way of sample; but there are in almost every part of the papers before us numerous evidences of the like inattention—the same slowness to examine—and the same quickness to decide. The busy season of the judicial year, Michaelmas term, in which apparently they considered the subject and framed their answers, will account for the strange oversights which have been committed. That circumstance will hardly excuse the confidence with which they have expressed themselves.

---

ART. VIII.—1. *Statistical Abstract for the United Kingdom in each year from* 1840 *to* 1853. Presented to both Houses of Parliament.

2. *Board of Trade Tables for the years* 1842 *to* 1853. Presented to both Houses of Parliament.

A TIME, appropriate if not imperative, seems to have come for 'taking stock' of our gains and losses from the new commercial system under which the buying and selling of the country has now been carried on in almost all departments for half-a-dozen years, and in some departments for periods of greater and various length. Even if these periods were not long enough to supply a fair criterion, at least for such uses as we shall put them to, the sad intrusion of a war, disturbing the natural course of events, and for a time rendering almost everything exceptional, makes further waiting of worse than no avail. If we have suffered losses, we must ere this have felt them; if we have made gains, we must be able to show them; and whatever we may lose or gain for some time to come will be ascribable, in a great though indefinite degree, to other and sterner causes than the legislative removal of protections and monopolies.

To carry the investigation over the whole field affected, or that may be supposed to be affected, by the great change it has been our lot to see and to aid—over the commercial, political, moral, and sanitary condition of the country—would be too vast an attempt; and we intend here to confine ourselves to some inquiries into what may seem an humble and even vulgar department of the subject. We aim at nothing higher than ascertaining how much better or worse off our people have been made in the matter of eating and drinking, since the commercial system of the country was revolutionised by the Acts of 1846 and their precursors and supplements. The subject may be mean in its details, but in the aggregate it is very large; and, moreover, it involves a great principle, of which these apparently sordid facts are the test. 'So paltry a sum as three pence,' said Burke, 'in 'the eyes of a financier, so insignificant an article as tea in the 'eyes of a philosopher, have shaken the pillars of a commercial 'empire that circled the whole globe.' The British sliding-scale and sugar duties, which cost office first to the Whigs and then to the Tories, may not involve so great a principle as the three-penny duty on tea, which cost Great Britain the American colonies; but still it is a great principle, and affects stupendous material as well as moral interests. It shall be our endeavour, therefore, to exhibit the facts with which we deal in their connection with that principle, and so, besides showing our new Food Statistics, which will be found better worth looking at than is ordinarily supposed, display their bearings on a question which, though practically solved and settled among ourselves, has still so much vitality as a matter of party controversy that but a few months have passed since it was used as a ladder to office, and which among our neighbours is still in conflict or yet unborn.

First in order naturally comes Bread, both from its inherent importance as the chief necessary of life, and from the laws regarding it having been the centre pillar of that system into the effects of whose downfal we are proposing to inquire. In this department, however, we cannot, as in some others, obtain official and infallible facts showing precisely the whole consumption of the country before and since the change—the ascertained figures showing only the imports, while the home-growth is left matter for cavil and conjecture. All we can do, therefore, is to see what is the actual amount of the additional imports we have procured through means of the new system, and then to inquire whether there is probability or even possibility in the assertion that these imports have come only in substitution, and not in addition.

Pretty nearly the sum of the whole matter is comprised in

the facts that, on the average of the seven years 1847-53, our annual consumption of foreign grain has been little short of *ten millions of quarters*, and that, under the old system, little or none of this supply could have been procured, with such prices as ruled during all the seven years of the period save the first and the last. A new supply of grain to the extent of ten millions of quarters annually: let us try to bring to perception, in a more realised and precise form, the fact, affecting millions of poor men's larders, which these figures indicate. The usual or indeed only calculation of the amount of grain or cereal food ordinarily consumed or consumable per head, has been one founded on certain local English statistics, and on some more extended and better-authenticated figures supplied by France. The calculation founded on these data was, that each unit of the English population consumes, or rather did consume under the system of scarcity, a quantity of the various kinds of grain equivalent to one quarter of wheat. This mode of estimate was adopted by Mr. Deacon Hume, in his celebrated evidence before the Import Duties Committee. The total quantity of grain, meal, and flour, stated in quarters, imported into the United Kingdom in 1853 was 10,173,135, of which 6,235,860 quarters were wheat; in 1852, total, 7,746,669, of which 4,164,603 were wheat; in 1851, total, 9,618,026, of which 5,330,412 were wheat; in 1850, total, 9,019,590, of which 4,830,263 were wheat; in 1849, total, 10,669,661, of which 4,802,475 were wheat; in 1848, total, 7,528,472, of which 3,082,230 were wheat; in 1847, total, 11,912,864, of which 4,464,757 were wheat. It will be seen at a glance, that the proportion of wheat to the total imports may be roughly stated at a half, and that in the last three years it considerably exceeded that proportion. Taking all the other grains over head as equivalent to half the same quantity of wheat, the imports of 1851, which we take as about an average of the last seven years, stand thus: —

| | Quarters. |
|---|---|
| Wheat - - - - - - | 5,330,412 |
| Other grains (4,287,614 quarters) reduced to the standard of Wheat - - - - | 2,143,807 |
| | 7,474,219 |

In round numbers, the annual imports — the annual *addition*, as we maintain, to our supply of bread since the removal of the Corn Laws — amount to seven and a half millions of quarters of wheat. Now, what does that mean? Unless all our statists have been mistaken, it means nothing less than this: that *we*

*have received an additional supply equivalent to the consumption,* or to what *was* the consumption, *of seven and a half millions of people.* Do not pass that fact lightly by. History has treasured up many smaller things. Taken even from a point of view which erroneously diminishes its magnitude, it means that between a third and a fourth has been added to the food of this nation of twenty-seven millions and a half, or rather to that article of food which is the first necessary of life. But as large sections of our population were previously in a condition to buy as much bread as they needed, and as other sections, chiefly the Irish peasantry, cannot be said to have attained bread even yet, it will not be rash to say that the increased supply has been taken off by an increased consumption confined to about one-half of the population — that fourteen millions of our people have by Free Trade been put upon full rations of bread, whom the Corn Laws had condemned to be half fed. The statement may seem startling; but we shall see results fully equal in magnitude in other cases where they were less to be expected, and where mistake is more impossible. It is a fact worth contemplating, though, being mainly in pursuit of facts, we cannot pause to moralise over each result. Even though there were any rational ground for the allegation of counterbalancing evils, this better feeding of fourteen millions of the poor is surely a great work. History, perhaps, does not show us many legislative transactions that so promptly bestowed so great a benefit. Yet that act, we ought not to forget, was not a giving, but a mere ceasing from withholding — a mere removal by the law-makers of the barriers which they themselves had set up between the food and the eaters.

In only one way has it been attempted to break the force of these facts. It has been asserted that the imported food has not been added, but substituted—that for every bushel that has come in from abroad, a bushel less has been grown at home. Does it not at once appear amazing that there should be any room for the making or the denying of such a statement—that it should be matter of wrangle and guess whether, at a certain time, the consumption of bread in this country increased by a third, or did not increase at all—whether the corn production of the three kingdoms stands where it did, or has increased, or has become extinct to the extent of one-third? On a former occasion (*Edinburgh Review*, No. 184) we pointed out some of the evils arising from this strange deficiency, and need not for the present purpose go much beyond a passing mention. It is a fact scarcely credited by foreigners (most of whom, as well as some of our own colonists, have long ago set us an example in this

respect), that while at this moment we could easily tell in any year the number of herrings caught and cured on the British coasts, of the bales of cotton grown in Georgia, or of chests of indigo produced in India, no man can do more than guess the quantity or proportion of agricultural produce in his own country, or even his own parish. The want has long been admitted, but never supplied. The Parliamentary Committees on Agricultural Distress, which sat down regularly every third or fourth year during the era of agricultural protection, elicited many complaints on this subject, but produced no suggestions. Before the Agricultural Distress Committee of 1836 the want of all reliable statistics in the trade was strongly stated. Thus, Mr. Sanders, the ex-Protectionist member for Wakefield (6318)—'I cannot conceive a duty more imperative on the Government, than to ascertain the quantity of food that the people are likely to be supplied with.' Mr. Sturge, the extensive corn-factor (7217)—'I think it might be done, at very small expense, with sufficient accuracy to be valuable as matter of reference.' The present Speaker of the House of Commons, who was Chairman of this Committee, afterwards published a long address to his constituents of North Hants, in which, among other remarks to the same effect, he says:—

'It was impressed upon the Committee that it would be of *infinite importance* to have accurate statistical information at some of the Government offices, for instance, at the Board of Trade, of the quantity of land in each parish employed in grain cultivation, stating the number of acres sown with wheat, barley, and oats, and the probable produce of the next harvest. I fully concur in this opinion: and I conceive that such a plan may be advantageously grafted on the present division of England into parochial unions, and may also be adapted to the Scotch counties, and baronies in Ireland, and that intelligent officers could be found who might furnish this information at a comparatively trifling expense.

'The publication of these returns periodically in the "London Gazette," for the information of persons engaged in the corn trade, would tend to lessen speculation, and to regulate the supply according to the demand, thereby reducing those elements of fluctuation in price which are so fatal to the interests of the farmer.'

This was said nearly eighteen years ago, and two decennial censuses, affording the best opportunity for procuring the needed information, have been taken since; but we are at this moment as much in the dark as ever as to this 'infinitely important' matter; and the only attempts that have been made to obtain a

remedy were a Bill introduced by the Free Trader, Mr. Milner Gibson, in 1847, on which the Protectionists threw cold water, and a memorial got up by the Highland and Agricultural Society of Scotland, a year *after* the census of 1851, since followed by a taking of crop and stock for the year 1853, in three Scottish counties. The difficulties in the way of obtaining this kind of information have been shown, by the experience of other countries, to be not at all insuperable: with little fuss or cost, Major Larcom gives us every year the agricultural statistics of Ireland; there is in Canada a periodical return of the utmost minuteness; and Ohio, and at least several of the other American States, appear to accomplish the object fully and with perfect facility. Instructive returns for two districts in England have been lately obtained, through the medium of the Poor Law Board, by Sir J. Walsham and Mr. Hawley. While Great Britain thus stands in this respect almost alone among the countries with which it would be reasonable to make a comparison, no other country needs the information so much, or is liable to suffer so greatly from the want of it. The want was severely felt by the moneyed and commercial communities last year, and has drawn forth a strong and influential memorial from the merchants of London, which, along with various concurrent efforts in other quarters, may probably, at some early time (so we infer from Lord Aberdeen's answer to the London memorial), lead to some remedy. Meanwhile, we should be entitled to protest against those who insist that Free Trade has brought us no more food, being allowed to escape in a mist virtually of their own making. But the point need not be insisted on, for the mist disperses at the first breath of inquiry.

There are two things which must be proved or supposed, before it can be admitted that our imports of foreign corn have only supplanted an equal quantity of home-grown,—that people have eaten less bread when it has been cheap than they did when it was comparatively dear, and that they have been forced to eat less bread during the same period in which they have been able to consume greatly increased quantities of many articles more costly and less necessary. Common sense and experience have hitherto concluded that cheapness means accessibility,—that when a commodity, and especially a commodity like bread, has been dear and becomes cheap, some will buy who scarcely bought before, and many who always bought will buy the more. And happily, though agricultural statistics are a maze, there are some articles scarcely less generally consumed than bread, of which we have statistics showing infallibly the precise number of pounds consumed in each year. Take sugar, for

instance. One of the endless and tangled string of resolutions ('140, d. 1.') which the Protectionist Lord George Bentinck submitted to the West India Distress Committee in 1848, wisely and truly said, 'It may with great assurance be calcu-'lated that the general consumption of sugar will decrease with 'any serious rise, and increase in more than a proportionate 'per centage with a decrease in price.' Lord George's words have been strikingly exemplified since they were written;—the consumption of Sugar in the United Kingdom, since the cheapening of price began in 1846, has (as we shall see more precisely when we come to speak of that article) not greatly short of *doubled.* Now, the difference in the prices of sugar before and since Free Trade has not been so great as the difference in the price of bread stuffs—at least until the middle of last year. Will any man, then, believe, that the people who have demonstrably consumed a so much greater quantity of sugar since it was lowered in price have, at the same time, been driven to the necessity of eating less bread, although it has undergone to a still greater extent the process of cheapening? Or take even an article on which the Customs' duties remained unaltered till a few months ago, but which, being in reality a necessary, or a necessary luxury, is liable to be affected by the increase or decrease of the purchasing power of the mass of the people,—take Tea. In the half-dozen years preceding Mr. Gladstone's reduction of last session, the consumption of tea increased a *fourth,* although the article was no cheaper than before. We might go on showing the same result literally on every article of general consumption; but enough, surely, has been said for the present purpose. Those to whom these facts are not decisive—who would say, or believe, that the same people were under the dismal necessity of eating less bread, even though it had been greatly cheapened, who yet were able during the same period to consume a great deal more sugar, which had been less cheapened, and a great deal more tea, which had not been cheapened at all,—must be a class so small and peculiar that they might safely be passed by in the argument; although, in dealing with the devices of a party who from beginning to end have been doomed to fight desperately against facts, it is well as we go along to stop up all the burrows.

There is only one supposable case in which the assertion that cheapness has diminished consumption could possibly be true, and that case could only be partial and temporary, and has not at present occurred at all. It might be that the cheapening of an article by importation, might diminish the number or means of its consumers among those employed in its home production.

But to say that this has happened in the present case, is easily seen to be nonsensical. Take in their order the three classes of men employed in, or dependent on, the growth of grain on our own soil. Landlords' rents may here and there have been reduced, though, on the whole, the fact is quite otherwise; but surely no landlord has eaten less bread. Some tenants who have not obtained an adjustment of their rents, may here and there have been stinted to the extent of somewhat retrenching in their sherry, or even in their brandy, but certainly not in their loaf. Agricultural labourers notoriously have not been crippled, but have been strengthened, in their powers of purchase. Employment for agricultural labourers never was more abundant than during the last few years, nor their wages higher; and bread, of which they always had too little under Protection, and especially wheaten bread, which Protection scarcely allowed them to taste, is certain to have been among the first luxuries to which they would apply their improved means. Such information regarding the previous condition of the mass of the agricultural population as is obtainable from evidence before Distress Committees, and from individual observation, is all to the effect that, not only were the labourers well off when prices were low, but worst off when prices were highest. In the frequent periods of what was called 'agricultural distress' it was never alleged—and surely this is a striking fact—that the distress had reached those who constitute at least nine-tenths of the agricultural population. This, for instance, is the universal testimony of the witnesses before the Agricultural Distress Committee of 1836, when prices were even lower than they have been at any time since the Repeal of the Corn Laws. Thus, Mr. G. Calthrop (7904):—'The main 'causes of the agricultural distress are, the reduction of prices, 'the burden of taxation, and *the price of labour*.' Mr. Jacob '(269):—'I believe employment is more abundant than ever it 'was.' Mr. Walker, Aberdeenshire (10,629):—'The condition 'of the labourers is good, and they are all employed.' Mr. Muntz (16,533):—'The present condition of the labourer has been very 'much relieved by the reduction in the price of the necessaries 'of life.' Earl of Radnor (16,858):—'The agricultural labourer 'is now better off than at any time since I have been living.' This is the evidence as to periods of low prices and 'agricultural 'distress;' it was then the agricultural labourers got highest wages, and consumed most bread. What rational ground, then, can there be for the assertion that low prices were causing them to eat less lately, even though former experience were not corroborated by the present evidence of men's own senses? There

is one other fact tending, by an opposite road, to the same conclusion, which ought not to be overlooked. The high prices, and other effects of Protection, had driven large numbers of the population, and chiefly of the agricultural population, to another species of food, which from 1847 to the middle of 1853 became dearer and scarcer as grain became cheaper and more plentiful. Mr. Jacob told the Distress Committee of 1836, that 'two millions of persons who used to subsist on wheat flour, now (1836) principally subsist on potatoes—a change which has been gradually coming on for twenty or twenty-five years.' Now, these two millions, finding of late potatoes more difficult, and wheat less difficult of access, must gradually, to no inconsiderable extent, have recruited the ranks of the bread-eaters. We can thus get a glimpse of what classes have now begun to eat bread, and what classes have begun to eat *more* bread, because bread is not so dear; let those whose case requires it, try to indicate where the classes are to be seen that are eating less bread because bread is cheaper.

In the face of facts such as we have cited, and of every man's local experience and information, it is childish to point, as has been done, to the fact that the total quantities of each kind of corn returned by the corn inspectors, as sold in the markets of England and Wales, show a decrease. The worthlessness of these returns for any such purpose as they have been sought to be applied to, is evident from the following, among other facts: —That they apply only to one out of the Three Kingdoms; that, at the utmost, *the returned sales do not include above a sixth or a seventh of the production of the country;* and that, presenting as they do, *not the actual quantity sold for consumption*, but *merely the number of sales* under which the parcels of grain may have changed hands, either for the first or for the tenth time, they indicate the amount rather of speculation than of supply;—to which we may add, that, after all, the decrease of the market sales in one or two recent years do not amount nearly to the proved increase from imports. The returns procured by Mr. Newdegate (Parl. Paper, No. 288. Session 1852) show, that while the quantity of wheat returned by the inspectors as sold in 1843, was 5,300,297 quarters, it was only 4,487,041 in 1851, being a decrease of 815,256 quarters. In 1851, the imports of wheat (this is not the main point, but it deserves to be marked in passing) were 5,330,412 quarters, against 1,064,942 in 1843, being an increase from this source of 4,265,570 quarters; so that, if we were to accept the number of market sales as equivalent to the quantities consumed, a decreased home production, to the extent of 815,256 quarters, would be seen to be

compensated for by an increased foreign supply of 4,265,570, the balance of gain in supply being 3,460,214 quarters. In other words, the change represented as having actually decreased the amount of food consumed, has, if these market returns were really available for the purpose for which we are referred to them, in the single item of wheat produced an increase equivalent to the food of three millions and a half of people; or, to state it in another form, the figures produced by Mr. Newdegate, if they show anything, tend to prove that to produce one quarter of home-grown grain it was necessary to exclude four quarters and a half of foreign! But, in point of fact, the market returns of sales prove nothing but the amount of speculation, as is easily seen, even if we look no farther than Mr. Newdegate's own Parliamentary paper. Nobody will deny that in 1847, at least an ordinary quantity of British grain was sold in the markets; the grain harvest of 1846 was a fair average; for the harvest of 1847, owing to the failure of the potato crop in the previous year and the very high grain prices, a more than usual breadth of land was put under cereal crops; and the temptation of 70s., and for a period 100s., a quarter, with the certainty of free imports and low prices next year, brought to the market all accumulations, either in granaries or stackyards—indeed, it might be assumed that a larger amount of British grain was that year sold and consumed than in any year preceding or following. Yet the Inspectors' returns bear that *less* grain was sold in that year than in any other! Or, to take a smaller, but as conclusive an evidence,—the quantity of *oats* returned as sold in 1843, was 2,218,931 quarters; but in 1847—though oats was the grain that had been chiefly sown in lieu of potatoes—the sales are represented as having fallen to 960,334 quarters! These figures, then, which we are asked to accept, tell us either that the oat crop of 1847 was a failure to the amount of more than one-half, or that only one-half the land sown with oats in 1843 had been put under the same crop in 1847, the other half of the oat land (for the returns of 1847 show a decrease in *all* the articles) being left waste. Since 1847, we have had the same effects as in 1847, from a different cause — from the steadiness of supply and price under Free Trade, having immensely decreased the gambling or speculation which formerly characterised the corn trade above all other trades. All these things are not only obvious inferences from the very figures to which Protectionists refer, but are in themselves notorious facts.

It remains to be added that, after five years of cheapness and plenty, Free Trade in corn has been subjected to the test of a

year of European scarcity and dearness. Let it be once admitted—and surely it will not be denied—that Free Trade never undertook to make bread cheap and plentiful in Britain at periods when nature had decreed that it should be everywhere scarce and dear, and it stands plain that Free Trade has worked quite as successfully under the one set of circumstances as under the other. What more could be expected than these two results — that, during a European scarcity, we should get our supplies as cheap as, or cheaper than those countries naturally in a more favourable position; and that we should get more and pay less than under the former system, in cases when our needs were incomparably greater. While other countries, during last autumn and winter, have been resorting desperately to all manner of artificial and costly devices for increasing imports, preventing exports, and keeping down prices, we, leaving things alone, have been more steadily and abundantly, if not also more cheaply, supplied than any of them. As a comparison with our own former experience under circumstances similar in character, though considerably different in degree, take the case of 1847, when nobody will deny that we needed more and paid higher than we did in 1853. Commuting flour into quarters of grain, we state the imports of 1847 at 4,464,757 quarters of wheat, and 7,448,107 of other kinds; in 1853, at 6,235,860 of wheat, and 3,937,275 of other kinds. Although the gross and nominal quantity was thus less in 1853 than in 1847, it will be seen that the quantity of *wheat* was about 30 per cent. *greater;* and considering, also, that the imports of 1847 comprised more than four millions, and those of 1853 only one million quarters and a half of Indian corn, there is no doubt that, taking the measurement by value and utility, and not by mere quantity, the imports of last year were more than equal to those of 1847. Yet, the average price of wheat in 1847 was 69*s.* 9*d.*, while in 1853 it was only 53*s.* 3*d.*; and nobody will think of denying that the difference in the amount of *need* between the two years is but inadequately measured by the difference in price.

At the risk, then, of being tedious, we have tried to meet even trifling obstacles attempted to be placed in the way of the grand conclusion which we sighted at the first step of this inquiry; for that conclusion is one well worthy of some labour and patience to cause it to stand out in its full magnitude, distinct and unencumbered. Nor could we take leave of this part of the subject in any manner better fitted to freshen and fix the impression of the result, than by its simple repetition — *under Free Trade the British people eat nearly a third more bread than they did before.*

In what is naturally the next great division—Animal Food—as we must proceed chiefly by assumption or inference, we shall make our journey short. The imports are trifling as compared with the consumption; but there is no doubt either as to the demand having increased, or as to the source whence it has been chiefly met. One of the first and most certain effects of cheapening bread is, inevitably, an increased consumption of its natural and coveted accompaniment. In a poor man's domestic economy, bread is the first thing, and butcher's meat the second. What he can spare from the purchase of former, goes first, and in largest measure, to the latter. At all former periods of low grain prices, it has been proved that the consumption of butcher's meat has increased; while, on the other hand, high grain prices have always lessened the demand and the price of animal food (except in such extreme and exceptional cases as 1847 and 1829, when absolute *dearth* of grain, and prices so exorbitant as to make grain almost as dear as flesh, increased demand and price in butcher's meat along with all other edible things). This was the testimony even of the most Protectionist witnesses before Parliamentary Committees, when speaking of the cheap grain period of 1834-5, and we have seen the thing before our eyes for the last three years in the increased consumption and enhanced prices. This increased consumption has been met chiefly by a greatly increased home-production, arising from the great spread of root crops, and improved and economised methods of feeding. This, however, is one of those points which, in the absence of agricultural statistics, we must be content to leave resting on general belief; and we quit it by expressing a conviction that, were the means of comparison obtainable, we should see one of the most remarkable portions of the industrial history of the country, and one of the greatest and most gratifying fruits of the change we are here investigating.

Having seen, as precisely as existing means allow, what has been the effect of the altered commercial system as to those prime necessaries our supplies of which are in chief part drawn from our own soil, we next pass on to those articles of food of less absolute necessity than bread and meat, but still of great importance, which we obtain entirely from other soils. And first among these we would place SUGAR, both on account of its importance as a commodity, and because it was till lately subjected to a monopoly, similar in nature and next greatest in extent and injustice to that in corn. We shall have a history very striking and instructive in its close similarity, but shall possess throughout more complete and certain data for discussion. The Custom House books show every hundred-weight of sugar con-

sumed in the country, whether colonial or foreign. And they show this strong, if not shameful, fact, that the monopoly law kept back from the consumers scarcely less than a half, not merely of what they needed (that point, under our still high, though scarcely protective duties, we have not nearly reached even yet), but of what they have been proved able to pay for even under the burdensome duty still existing. We ought not to dread inattention to the history and details of a question involving, not only great principles in political economy, but the comfort of millions of scanty tables; but by way of decoy, we may begin by a glimpse of the subject in its totality. The difference to the actual consumers between the present prices and those preceding Free Trade, may be roundly stated as the difference between 5*d.* and 8*d.* per lb., and the amount of that difference on seven millions and a half of lbs., is the sum we have saved on last year's sugar. The sum the consumers paid last year for sugar, may be stated at 17,554,103*l.*; the same quantity under the former prices would have cost 28,086,689*l.*; in other words, our annual saving in sugar is 10,500,000*l.* sterling, or double the amount of the Income Tax! Or, to put the case in another, and perhaps still stronger shape, Free Trade enabled us to consume last year nearly *double* the quantity we ever consumed under Protection!

The mere figures of the sugar question are full of a meaning and interest far greater, and, as we may say, more human, than attaches to them as mere statistics of trade. They mark with a painful accuracy the extent to which selfish and foolish laws may intercept the bounties of Providence. They tell how millions of persons for generations were stinted and plundered in a commodity which custom, if not nature, has made a necessary—how ingenuity was racked to find the most effective means of emptying and taxing the poor man's sugar-bowl, with the object of filling the pockets of a few hundreds of men, who, after all, were found to be unsatisfied and unprosperous. And, happily, the figures also show the rapidity with which, when the interfering hand of legislation was even but partially removed, nature and justice reclaimed their own. Let these things be borne in mind, even to a portion of the extent to which they really exist, and there is no danger that the figures to which we must resort in order to show what was done and is now being undone, will seem dry bones.

There is matter enough to raise curiosity and reflection, if not at once indignation, in the fact with which we start—a fact revealing, at one flash, almost the whole iniquity of the bygone system—that the consumption of sugar in the United Kingdom

*stood still* during all the quarter of a century from 1817 to 1841. During that period our population had increased by seven or eight millions (from nineteen to twenty-six-and-a-half millions); and these eight millions had, in regard to this desired and necessary commodity, found, as it were, the table full—had found that they could get nothing, save by making less the little that had been provided for their predecessors. The rations were a fixed quantity; there might be a few millions more of eaters, but we had legislated so that there should be nothing more to eat. And how entirely that was the work of the law, the figures tell too. In 1817, we consumed in all 3,298,241 cwts. of sugar; in 1840, the year preceding that in which men in office first proposed to apply a little of the principle of Free Trade to this and other great commodities, we consumed 3,594,834 cwts.; in the year last closed, we consumed *seven millions and a half* of cwts. *Stationary* during twenty-five years of Protection; nearly *doubled* during one-fourth that period of Free Trade;—there in a sentence is the epitome and moral of the sugar question.

The details of which these are the results afford every possible variety of illustration of the fact, that under no increase in the amount and urgency of the demand arising from increase of wealth and population were our West India colonies (for whose benefit the system was framed) able, under the protective duties, to supply our wants. The 'British Plantations' (*i. e.*, exclusive of Mauritius and the East Indies) sent us, in 1817, a little more than three-and-a-quarter millions of cwts.; in 1825, they sent us nearly a million *less;* in 1840, only 2,428,567 cwts., and continued about the same figures till 1846. In truth, the supply from that source may be described as not materially altered for twenty-five years (though on that point we shall presently be more specific), as constantly declining rather than augmenting, alike under high prices and low prices, under slavery, under the apprenticeship, and under freedom.

In August, 1846, the first slide in the new scale, intended to end in Free Trade, came into operation. That year the quantity of sugar entered for home consumption from the British plantations in America had been only 2,306,744 cwts. In 1847, the first year of competition, the entries from that source rose to 2,582,589 cwts.; in 1848, to 2,770,597; in 1849, 3,070,265; in 1850, 2,740,633; in 1851, 2,704,632; in 1852, 3,564,749; in 1853, 3,061,985. What we have been here seeing is, that the monopoly of the market, either under slavery or under freedom, did not induce the West Indians to increase their supplies; and that so little were monopoly and high prices a stimulus, that we are getting as much from them now as ever.

That there was no remedy for the evil of languishing supplies and increasing demand, save that which was so long delayed, and which has proved so effective and beneficial, appears still more clearly when we examine the progress, or rather want of progress, of our supplies from *all* quarters previous to the legislation of 1846. The various changes in the sugar laws previous to the Free Trade change of 1846 were as follows:— In 1826, the duty on West Indian sugar was reduced from 30*s.* to 27*s.* a cwt.; in 1830, to 24*s.*, at which it remained till August, 1846; the duty on Mauritius sugar was 37*s.* till 1825, and was then reduced to the same rate as West Indian; the duty on East Indian was 37*s.* up to 1830, was then reduced to 32*s.*, and in 1835 to 24*s.*; foreign sugar was under the almost prohibitory duty of 63*s.* per cwt. till 1844, when any portion that could be certified as the produce of free labour was made admissible at 34*s.* The observant reader will see at a glance the object at which almost all these changes aimed—to increase, if possible, the supply without infringing on the virtual monopoly of the West Indies; and the following figures, showing the total quantities of all kinds entered for consumption in each year, during the period with which we are at present dealing, will show how utter was the failure:—

| Year. | Cwts. | Year. | Cwts. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1824 | 3,591,146 | 1835 | 4,022,841 |
| 1825 | 3,271,385 | 1836 | 3,593,137 |
| 1826 | 3,788,497 | 1837 | 4,048,663 |
| 1827 | 3,539,860 | 1838 | 4,021,240 |
| 1828 | 3,879,250 | 1839 | 3,830,390 |
| 1829 | 3,809,706 | 1840 | 3,594,407 |
| 1830 | 4,057,224 | 1841 | 4,057,878 |
| 1831 | 4,076,251 | 1842 | 3,868,437 |
| 1832 | 3,879,808 | 1843 | 4,028,307 |
| 1833 | 3,766,405 | 1844 | 4,129,443 |
| 1834 | 3,928,556 | 1845 | 4,856,624 |

How little effect all the alterations above specified had so long as they proceeded on the principles of Protection, and how little effect an increased demand had in procuring an increased supply (with the single exception of 1845, the year of the railway mania and exorbitant wages), are so plainly told by the above figures as to need very little exposition. And this result, or want of result, would have been still more glaring, but for the operation of the only one

among the changes that tended towards a free trade, viz., the placing of Mauritius on the same ground as West Indian—a change which immediately raised the Mauritius supplies from a mere driblet to half a million of cwts.; then to three-fourths of a million; and before 1846 to more than a million, or nearly a fourth of the whole supply. But for this, the above table would have told a tale even more dismal than it now presents. The admission of free-labour foreign, in 1844, was quite an illusory change, producing only 77,254 cwts. in 1845, and 21,507 in 1846. The other changes, which merely reduced the duties without reducing the protection, took large slices off the revenue, but brought us, as the figures show, no more sugar. It is curious to remember that this fact, instead of making the monopolists ashamed or afraid of their system, was actually seized by them as an argument in defence of things as they were. The people, argued Lord George Bentinck's Report, use no more sugar in 1846 than they did twenty-five years before; therefore, they *want* no more. That remarkable statist even went the length of showing in figures how, under no conceivable circumstances, could the people consume more than 5,600,000 cwts. of sugar. The very year that prophecy was issued—although the first slide under the Free Trade duties, which still left a great 'protection,' was only in operation from the 18th of August—the consumption sprang up to 5,220,248 cwts.; in 1847, in spite of the commercial reaction, it was 5,779,508.

| Year. | Cwts. | Year. | Cwts. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1848 | 6,142,296 | 1851 | 6,255,574 |
| 1849 | 5,922,388 | 1852 | 7,203,641 |
| 1850 | 6,112,321 | 1853 | 7,523,187 |

The story told, the lesson taught, by these two clusters of figures should need no embellishment or improvement. Freedom of trade, the simple expedient of leaving commerce alone, did at a stroke what the most ingenious, and complex, and varied devices of restriction and 'regulation' never had and never would have accomplished. Even in 1847, which was a year of actual famine, and in 1848, which was a year memorable for political panic and commercial disorder, the people were able to obtain a fourth more of this great article of diet than they were able to do even during the high profits, and high wages, and reckless expenditure of the 'railway years' immediately preceding! To the extent of its range the Sugar Monopoly

created, even in times of the greatest prosperity, a far severer dearth than existed under Free Trade, even in times of the greatest depression.

It was, of course, *price* that formed the grand obstacle to the increase of consumption. As is visible, more or less, in the history of all protected products, the price fluctuated violently, but production underwent no cheapening process. The gazette price of British Muscovado sugar was 49*s.* 8*d.* per cwt., in 1817; it was much the same (49*s.* 1*d.*) in 1840. Perhaps we ought not to say there had been no cheapening in the production; but if there had, it obviously had not reached the consumer. But this was not all: the reductions of duty which we have above enumerated went, for the most part, into the pockets of the planters. Reductions in the Colonial duties, while the Foreign duties remained unreduced (which was the case till 1846), amounted to an increase of Protection. The planters, whose powers of exaction were only limited by the consumers' powers of paying, were thereby enabled to raise the price in bond, and the consumers paid as much or more for their sugar than they had done before. Thus, in 1826, when the duty on Colonial was reduced by 3*s.*, the price in bond was 30*s.* 7*d.*; but the price was 35*s.* 9*d.* next year. In 1830, when the duty on Colonial was further reduced by 4*s.*, the price in bond was so low as 24*s.* 11*d.*; but by 1836 it was 40*s.* 10*d.*, and in 1840, 49*s.* 1*d.* Where, then, had gone the reductions of duties? They had been taken from the Treasury to give to the planters. The sugar duties, which had produced 4,433,926*l.* in 1817, and 5,002,297*l.* in 1828, produced only 3,574,471*l.* in 1845, the last year of Protection. Mark the cruelty and trickery of the system that had been overthrown in this, that *each reduction of duty was an additional tax*, a device by which, while the consumers were made to pay as much or more for their sugar, the revenue suffered a reduction which they had to make up in some other form. And this shows but a part, and not the cruellest part of the tax. It shows the amount of exaction from those who could pay, but not the amount of *deprivation* inflicted on those who could not.

Of the fact that any increase of price in this article — an article largely consumed by the poorer classes, and very important to their comfort, though not necessary to their existence — operated with a remarkable instantaneousness and severity in diminishing the consumption, we have a very notable confession in the Report which Lord George Bentinck, then the champion of the Sugar Monopolists, submitted to the West Indian Distress Committee of 1848: — 'That your Committee

'are aware that extraordinary prosperity and prolific fruit seasons will, in exceptional cases, as in 1834 and 1835, countervail the natural effects of a high price of sugar upon the general consumption; but as a general rule, it may with great sureness be calculated that the consumption of sugar will decrease with any serious rise and increase in more than a proportionate per-centage with a decrease in price.'

In illustration of this important fact, Lord George compiled a table, showing the rise or fall in the duty-paid prices, and the rise or fall in the amount of consumption, in each year from 1823 to 1847, whereby it appears that (with the exception of two years) whenever the price fell the consumption rose, and whenever the price rose the consumption fell. In most other articles the increased number and increased power of the consumers causes both an increased consumption and, up to a certain point, enhanced prices — that is, demand or consumption rules price. But in this article, standing on the border between absolute necessaries and what may be called necessary luxuries, price ruled consumption inexorably. In the years comprised in Lord George Bentinck's table, the population had increased by more than six millions, or nearly a third, but the quantity consumed had not increased at all. The Monopolists, it will thus be seen, had the consumers utterly at their mercy — they had command of a great engine of extortion, and worked it with remorseless severity.

The case may be put into a still more practical and effective form by looking at the diminishing share of this important article which fell to each person as the population went on increasing. Increasing demand and stationary supplies in the food of a nation have the same effect as a stationary demand and a diminishing supply have among the crews of water-logged or stranded vessels — day by day each man's share grows less and less. In the debates of 1841, Mr. Labouchere read in the House of Commons the following statement, made up by the Custom-house, of the consumption per head of sugar and (converted) molasses in the eleven years preceding: —

| Year. | Lbs. | Year. | Lbs. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1830 | 20 | 1836 | $16\frac{5}{6}$ |
| 1831 | 20 | 1837 | $18\frac{1}{3}$ |
| 1832 | 19 | 1838 | $18\frac{1}{3}$ |
| 1833 | 18 | 1839 | $17\frac{1}{4}$ |
| 1834 | $18\frac{1}{3}$ | 1840 | $15\frac{1}{4}$ |
| 1835 | $19\frac{1}{3}$ | | |

Remembering how our trade and wealth had increased in that period, these figures sufficiently tell their own tale. And we have even worse results if we carry the examination further back and further forward. In 1814 there were 412,231,680 lbs. (3,680,640 cwts.) of sugar for less than twenty millions of persons, so that each person then got 20½ lbs.; in 1845, the last year of Protection, twenty-seven millions of persons got 462,497,616 lbs. (4,129,443 cwts.), the share of each person being reduced to 17 lbs. The rations of sugar served out to the nation under the Protective system had thus, in spite of our increased tastes and improved means, been diminished by a seventh. The amount per head then attainable by the industrious, energetic, and comfort-loving people of this country — and thirty years' experiment had proved that it never could be greater under the then existing system — fell short by a third, even taking rich and poor together, of the allowance found necessary in workhouses, and, by more than a half, of the allowance given to sailors and domestic servants — a means of comparison in which very little, if any, deduction should be made on account of children being reckoned in the consumption of the general population, there being no article which, in various shapes and uses, goes so largely into the food of the young. Such was the point at which we had arrived after every possible modification and adjustment of the protective system had been resorted to. How entirely these results were the fruit of Protection we shall see at a glance when we turn to the results under even the short and partial experience we have had of a better system.

But, first, it may be well to bring to mind, that the mode of estimate we have been compelled to resort to proceeds on the rough, and, indeed, palpably erroneous hypothesis, that high prices affected the consumption of all classes alike. There is a certain or rather uncertain proportion of the population — taken by most statists at a fourth—whose consumption of such an article as sugar is not affected by even such an addition to the natural price as was made by the protective laws. These, therefore, we have to deduct from the population on whom the high prices inflicted scarcity—the scarcity which we have seen in the gross falling, of course, in a greater proportion on the remaining three-fourths of the population. And the farther down the more severe the infliction—till at last we reach large classes to whom the sugar laws were a positive prohibition of sugar. In illustration of this, we may adduce the fact that it is shown by the custom-house books (formerly, though not now, available for that purpose), that, up to 1845,

the consumption per head in *Ireland*, had never exceeded 5 lbs., or about *one-fourth* of the consumption per head, taking the three kingdoms over! In this fact, we have conclusive evidence that the sugar laws press with a four-fold greater severity on the poor than on the population taken in mass; and thus it is to be inferred that even yet these classes do not participate fully, and a proportion of them perhaps not at all, in the amount of benefit hitherto achieved. There is, of course, no getting at anything that can be relied on as arithmetical accuracy in dealing with such materials; all that can be done is to enjoin remembrance of the facts that the decrease of consumption per head under the old system, capable of being so stated arithmetically, must be understood as meaning that the suffering fell solely, and of course in an increasing ratio, on the more or less poor; and that the figures to which we now come, showing the increase of consumption under the new system, must be held as meaning that the increase has been shared chiefly by the same classes, but excluding, not only the rich, but also a proportion of the very poor, to whom the article, highly taxed though scarcely protected, is still unattainable.

Under these explanations a mere glance takes in the statistics of what we may not refrain from calling the marvellous effects of that return to justice and natural laws which it has been our good fortune to see accomplished in our own day. We have seen that in 1845, the last year of Protection, our twenty-seven millions could only obtain the same supply of sugar that our less than twenty millions could obtain nearly thirty years before; and that, with increasing means and desires, the share falling to each person had been becoming less and less. Last year, the consumption (besides molasses) was more than seven and a half millions of cwts. which, divided among less than twenty-seven and a half millions of people, gives fully thirty lbs. per head! These sugar statistics of the last year under Free Trade, and of 1845, the last year of Protection, are worth re-presenting in a tabular and more concise form.

| | | Total Consumption. | Consumption per Head. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1845 | Protection | 4,129,443 cwts. | 17 lbs. |
| 1853 | Free Trade | 7,523,187 cwts. | 30 lbs. |

The change is marvellous, but the more immediate means by which it has been accomplished are easily perceptible, and are in themselves strongly confirmatory of much that has been here said. The reduction in price on that kind of sugar most generally in use may be taken as the difference between 8*d.* and 5*d.* per lb. to the consumer—a difference, it will be seen, cor-

responding almost precisely with the increased consumption. The same sum, therefore, which the nation spent on sugar before it spends on sugar still; but for the same sum it gets nearly double the quantity. Here, then, from another point of view, we get sight of the fact that the monopolists made us pay double price and put us on half supplies. Remembering what has been said as to there being certain classes to whom 8*d.* per lb. was no obstacle, and other classes to whom even 5*d.* a lb. remains an obstacle still, we might perhaps venture to state the sum of the whole matter thus—that free trade, which, taking the population over head, has nearly doubled the consumption of sugar, has, to the greater number of consumers, nearly trebled it. Such facts ought not to be passed by as mere details of commerce. They tell with stern precision the story of a great wrong and a great remedy.

There is scarcely a commodity in or out of the tariff, the consumption of which it is more desirable to see growing and prospering than this. Sugar, though not necessary to the existence, is essential to the comfort of our population. If in some sense a luxury, it is one whose whole tendency and effects are excellent—a luxury promotive of temperance and home-keeping—a luxury not of the tap-room and tavern, but of the family and fireside. That for generations the ingenuity of the legislature should have been directed towards the most effective means of enhancing the price (which means diminishing the consumption) of such an article, is a thing, unhappily, too remarkable for history to overlook. That it should have been by the public men and public opinion of our day that that system was overthrown, is a thing for which we ought to be proud and grateful, in the assurance that, though some among us may slight or question it now, history will recognise its importance and beneficence.

What we have been seeing is, we maintain, the end of the question—the conclusion of the whole matter. But, in the case of sugar, as in that of bread, we are called on to meet the objection that these great benefits to the consumers have been counteracted by great injuries to the producers—that the great public gain has been a ruinous private loss—that the public has snatched an advantage at the cost of a class. This plea, which is found accompanying the removal of every wrong or abuse, is generally more powerful in appealing to sympathy or sentiment than to justice; but, in this case, there is little or no room even for that appeal. The argument is not perplexed by fears regarding the labouring masses employed in the branch of production said to have been injuriously affected. On the contrary, the cry

is, that the hundreds of thousands of persons whose manual labour is employed in the production of sugar, are *too* well off, better off than ever they were before—that wages are too high, and the supply of labour inadequate to the demand. The question is thus greatly narrowed and simplified. The only parties alleged to be distressed or injured by the change are the owners and occupiers — a body very small in point of number, and having no claims fitted in a mere matter of sentiment and sympathy to outweigh the claims of the tens of millions of consumers. To say merely that what has benefited the consumers has injured the capitalist portion of the producers, is to say nothing to the purpose, unless it can also be shown that the advantage of the consumers has been obtained to the *unjust* disadvantage of the producers. Till that is done, there is as much reason to assume that the producers have only lost a monopoly to which they were never entitled, and which they possessed too long, as that they have been deprived of anything that was naturally or justly theirs.

Now we have seen, in some detail, what the nature and effects of the former system were—a rigorous monopoly by means of which the West India planters gave what supply and exacted what price they chose—that supply being one-half and that price nearly double of what they should and might have been. Was there any contract or obligation, moral or political, expressed or implied, by which that gigantic monopoly,—gigantic in its evils to the one party, though not in its benefits to the other, — should have continued for ever? We utterly deny it. The sugar monopoly was simply an injustice imposed when the people had little more than a nominal power in the legislature, and which they naturally got rid of when they were able and thought proper. It is said that the Act of Emancipation gave the West Indian interest a claim to protection not possessed by other protected interests,—that, in fact, monopoly was the substitute and compensation for slavery. This is the ground on which for the last few years, but for the last few years only, the supporters of the Sugar Monopoly have taken their stand and fought their battle. But surely there is one simple and undeniable fact rendering any such ground untenable. In the mere fact that the monopoly did not chronologically come in place of slavery, but had co-existed along with it—nay, had formed, we may say, part of the same system—we have a sufficient demolition of that position. And we have also a supplementary fact sufficient for that purpose—that what was judged an adequate, or something like an adequate, compensation for the property in slaves was paid in money as part of the Act of

Emancipation; and nothing whatever was at that time said or understood regarding the perpetuity of the twin evil. There were two evils, kindred and co-operating, to be dealt with; the legislature dealt with them in a certain order; but assuredly never gave any ground for the allegation that by abolishing the one it gave a guarantee to perpetuate the other!

It is, we maintain, folly to say that monopoly was a substitute for the slavery with which it had all along co-existed. And it is monstrous, — whether or not twenty millions of pounds sterling was a sufficient market price for the 780,993 pieces of goods that were transformed into men, women, and children, by the Act of Emancipation — it is, we maintain, monstrous to say that at that time, and by that Act, or at any time, or by any act, or by any word, this nation of twenty-seven millions, for the benefit of a few scores of West Indian landowners, bound itself and its posterity to all generations to live upon half-rations of one of the necessaries of life!

But let us come down from this broad and impregnable ground; and, although it be somewhat supererogatory, inquire whether, after all, these West Indian landowners have suffered as much since the change as is generally assumed, or at least whether, if they have suffered, Free Trade be the cause. There is no better test by which to try this question than the amount of production at the different periods; for the complaint is, that the reduction of price, and the alleged increased cost of labour, are making the British Antilles a desert. We take the Parliamentary Paper 442 of Session 1852, to ascertain the former and present *imports* of West India sugar into this country, which, it may be necessary to inform some readers, differ somewhat, at least in the earlier periods, from the quantities entered for home consumption, with which we have hitherto been dealing. During the thirty-three years from the commencement of the century to the passing of the Emancipation Act, the annual import of West India sugar (which may be taken as pretty near the whole amount shipped from the place of production) averaged rather above $3\frac{1}{2}$ millions of cwts., never touching 4 millions save in five years (1820, 1826, 1828, 1829, and 1831), in which years it barely passed that figure. After Emancipation, in 1833, it maintained the former average till 1838, but in 1839 it fell, and, till a certain time, which the reader will presently be called upon to mark, continued depressed; the following being the number of cwts. for each year from 1838 to 1846, inclusive: —

| Year. | Cwts. | Year. | Cwts. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1838 | 3,521,434 | 1843 | 2,503,567 |
| 1839 | 2,823,931 | 1844 | 2,452,778 |
| 1840 | 2,202,833 | 1845 | 2,854,010 |
| 1841 | 2,145,500 | 1846 | 2,147,363 |
| 1842 | 2,508,910 | | |

This, let it be marked, was the point at which matters stood with West Indian production *before Free Trade.* What followed? In 1847, the first year of foreign competition, the production of sugar in the West Indies, which we have seen was little above two millions of cwts. in the preceding year, instead of declining, sprang up to 3,199,821 cwts., being an increase of more than a third, and higher than it had been in any of the nine years preceding! But let us move on. The table just given shows the amount of West India production in the nine years preceding Free Trade. The following shows the history of that production in each year since: —

| Year. | Cwts. | Year. | Cwts. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1847 | 3,199,821 | 1851 | 3,065,360 |
| 1848 | 2,795,311 | 1852 | 3,569,953 |
| 1849 | 2,839,911 | 1853 | 3,061,985 |
| 1850 | 2,587,420 | | |

There are two grand facts appearing plainly on the face of these figures—that any decline that has taken place in the amount of production in the West Indies occurred in the period between Emancipation and Free Trade; and that since Free Trade the tendency has been upwards to such an extent that the production of the two last years was above the average production even previous to emancipation. On this latter fact we might take our stand, and refuse, as of right, to go any further into the question. But, content in the meanwhile with noting the fact that, so far as dates or anything else give warrant for charging imperial legislation with any diminution of West India production, the charge applies not to the Free Trade Act of 1846, but to the Emancipation Act of 1833, we proceed to meet the latter fact, but only briefly, as not being thoroughly relevant to our proper subject. And, first of all, we would remark, that it would be unreasonable to have expected that the Emancipation

Act should *not* have given rise to some diminution and difficulty in production. The assumption that the West Indies would go on at once to produce as abundantly and as cheaply as before, proceeds on the same important misconception or obliviousness that runs through all the West Indian complaints—it omits the fact that this country did not pay twenty millions sterling for nothing. How nearly that sum came to the market value of the slaves is a somewhat complicated and uncertain question, on which it is not necessary here to enter. At all events, it amounted, according to the statements of the colonists themselves, to twelve years' purchase of the whole profits of the rum and sugar production in the West Indies. Why was that money paid? Certainly because it was expected that, after emancipation, the West Indies would not be able to produce so cheaply or so plentifully. Yet the complainers seem to think that they have established a case of grievance by merely asserting that they grow less sugar, or grow it at a greater cost, than they did before. Suppose that the imperial legislature had, in order to procure some great benefit for the labouring class in this country, paid the corn and meat producers of the three kingdoms the value of twelve years' purchase of the landlords' rents and the farmers' profits, what would have been thought of the landlords and the farmers coming back in two or three years complaining that, owing to the labourers having become better off, they could not get so much work out of them at so little cost as they did before, and making no account of having received an enormous sum of money in anticipatory compensation of that very result? Except that the thing was done on a smaller scale, and at a greater distance, this is in truth the West Indian case. Nay, the West Indian case is more fallacious and more audacious. For the planters argue, that, besides paying them twenty millions in consideration of the increased cost of production, we are bound also to give them such a monopoly of the market as shall render that increased cost of no account; that, in short, by our twenty millions we purchased only the privilege of paying for their products more than ever *for* ever.

The sort of redress demanded is also, as sufficiently exhibited by the facts we have just been stating, curiously and suicidally at variance with the alleged grounds of complaint. In the years following Emancipation there was a decrease in production, but in the years following Free Trade there has been an increase; the total West Indian production having been 14,612,128 cwts. in the six years preceding Free Trade, and 18,057,776 cwts. in the six years following Free Trade. If then we are to follow

the evidence of dates, and of all such facts as are obtainable, we are drawn towards the conclusion that if Emancipation has acted as the bane, Free Trade has acted as the antidote. But see what the West Indians ask. Not that slavery shall be restored, nor that compensation shall be supplemented, but that Free Trade shall be desisted from. They ask a return, not to the system of slavery, under which they produced as much as or more than they produce at present, but to the system of 'Protection,' with free labourers, under which they showed themselves able to produce less than they have produced under the system which exists.

But in restricting our view to the West Indies, we have been giving more than fair play to Protection and less than that to Free Trade. Mauritius had its slaves and (after 1825) its portion in the monopoly, and is now exposed to the same competition; yet the annual imports of sugar from Mauritius, which used formerly to be a mere driblet, now reach more than a million and a quarter of cwts., being equal to a third of the West Indian production, and have *doubled* since the commencement of Free Trade in 1846. Taking the Mauritius along with the West Indies, the imports of colonial sugar in 1852 were 4,524,634 cwts., *being the greatest import of colonial sugar ever known;* and last year the figures, so far as ascertained, were not much less. To this we are entitled to add for 1852 1,304,139 cwts. (and about the same amount for last year) of East Indian sugar, which is in the same category as to Free Trade, though not as to Emancipation. We should then find that the total imports of British, as distinguished from Foreign sugar, in 1852 was 5,825,773 cwts. (it was slightly less last year), being nearly two million cwts. more than the total consumption in almost any year before Free Trade. Even laying aside all questions of previous compensation and of common justice to the consumers, the case might be perilled on the impossibility of reconciling with the idea of ruin or real distress results like these.

To cover the whole ground, we are willing to go further, and to take up the position that the West Indian complaints, so far as they are real, had an existence not only before Free Trade but before Emancipation. And is there not sufficient evidence of this in the mere fact which we have already seen that, in spite of the increasing numbers and needs of the consumers, the production of West Indian sugar had *stood still for half a century?* In that we have a pretty strong indication that the capabilities of the soil, even under slavery, had been reached or surpassed, and that under any system the tendency thence-

forth must have been downwards. But we are not left to mere indications; the planters themselves, before almost as many committees as sat upon the distress of the other great protected interest, testified, during the period of protection and slavery, that they were very ill off, and, though they could not tell how, very ill used. In 1806 a House of Commons' Committee resolved, on West Indian evidence, that the then price (43*s.* 9*d.* a cwt. in bond) was 'not only insufficient to yield any profit, but 'even to indemnify for actual outlay.' In only nine out of the forty years that elapsed between the making of that statement and the introduction of Free Trade, did the price reach that point which was thus settled, not only to be the lowest that could possibly be borne, but to be intolerable and absolutely ruinous! So that, unless the planters and the Parliamentary Committees had been talking nonsense, or worse, the ruin of the West Indian interest must have been pretty well advanced long before the event to which it now ascribes all its ills. And that it really was in a depressed condition long before Emancipation, as well as before Free Trade, is indeed quite notorious. By far the greater portion of the compensation money went in redemption or reduction of mortgages. And this leads to the inquiry whether, while the Emancipation gave to the sugar growers twenty millions of much needed money, Free Trade may not have given them something also. It has given them what Free Trade always gives, and the want of which was no small cause of their former distress—*steadiness of price.* When the planters complained, in 1806, that they got only 31*s.* a cwt. (this was their statement, and was doubtless correct at the particular moment the testimony was given, but the average of the year, as given in the 'London Gazette,' is, as we have already mentioned, 43*s.* 9*d.*), they doubtless remembered, feelingly, that in 1800 the price had been 68*s.* 1*d.*, but seemed to have forgotten, though they must have felt, that in 1802 it had fallen to 36*s.* 6*d.* In 1814 it was up at 73*s.* 4*d.*; in 1822 it was down to 31*s.*; in 1830 to 24*s.* 11*d.*; and in 1831 to 23*s.* 8*d.* In 1840 it was up again to 49*s.* 1*d.* A produce so 'regulated' that its price leaped between 73*s.* and 23*s.* could never be a safe, consequently never a truly profitable trade. When Lord Grenville, in his famous protest in the House of Lords against the imposition of the Corn Laws, denounced monopoly as 'the 'parent of dearness and of scarcity,' he did well to add, 'and of 'uncertainty.'

Let us, then, recapitulate in few and plain words, the facts brought out by an examination of the former and present statistics of the sugar question:—

The people of the United Kingdom are now consuming about *double* the quantity of sugar per head that they did only ten years ago.

The sum paid for the quantity we consumed last year was less than the sum the same quantity could have been purchased for under Protection, by 10,500,000*l.*

The production of sugar in the British colonies is greater than at any former period whatever.

At this point we may be held to leave those articles whose consumption has been greatly and directly affected by alterations in unison with the principle of Free Trade, made on their duties since 1846, the period to which we wish chiefly to confine our retrospect. There are some articles of scarcely less importance than the one with which we have just been dealing, the monopoly or protection for which had been in great part, and in some cases altogether, removed previous to 1846; and there are others, the fiscal burdens or regulations on which never did, and do not now, partake of the nature of protection — on the consumption of both of which classes of articles the measures of 1846 have nevertheless exercised a powerful influence. The purchasing power set free by the cheapening of such articles as bread and sugar is, in the nature of things, employed chiefly in procuring increased quantities of the articles next in necessity or favour. The benefit derived from the application of Free Trade to certain articles is not only that people are enabled to get more of these articles — to get enough of them for less money than they formerly paid for too little — but that they are enabled to get more of *other* articles which may not by any recent legislation have been much, or at all, affected in price. In a word, we have hitherto been examining what may more strictly be called the direct and immediate effects of the new system: we are now proceeding to examine what may be classed as the indirect effects, though not less certainly flowing from the same source.

In placing COFFEE first among the class of articles with which we have now to deal, we are guided neither by its being the most important nor by its consumption exhibiting the largest proportional increase since 1846 (for peculiar circumstances have retarded its rate of growth), but by its having been formerly under protection, more or less rigorous, though gradually relaxing since the commencement of the century, and having since 1846 undergone some alterations bringing it further under the action of Free Trade. It thus occupies a position rendering it a sort of connecting link between the class of articles with which we have been dealing, and that on which we are entering.

But it is requisite, for the understanding of the results, to go back some way, and discover on what principles our legislators proceeded in their many and complicated dealings with this important article of food.

At first, and for a long period, a chief object of the legislation on coffee, scarcely second to that of protection, was the raising of revenue. The attempts made for this object are somewhat curious and instructive, as illustrating the truth that in taxation two and two do not necessarily make four. The problem was, how to raise most revenue; and the legislature succeeded most where it attempted least. At the commencement of the century the duty on West India coffee, (foreign being entirely, and East India being almost, excluded) was 1*s.* 6*d.* per pound; the consumption did not rise above $\frac{3}{4}$ of a million of lbs., while the sum contributed by the population per head through this branch of the revenue was $1\frac{1}{4}d.$ In 1841 the duty was 6*d.* per pound; the consumption was $27\frac{1}{4}$ millions of lbs.; and the contribution to the revenue per head $10\frac{1}{2}d.$ In other words, the rate of the tax was reduced a third, and yet its amount was increased more than eightfold.

At present, however, it is with the history of protection in this article, and afterwards with the effect produced on its consumption by the opening of the trade in other articles, that we have properly to do. For a long time, as in the case of sugar, not only was the foreign article expressly or virtually excluded, but the West Indies were protected against the East Indies. The differential duty as between West and East Indies underwent almost incessant alterations, varying from 100 to 50 per cent., up to 1819, when the duties were made 1*s.* per pound on West Indian and 1*s.* 6*d.* per pound on East Indian, which were altered to 6*d.* and 9*d.* respectively in 1825, which duties were maintained till 1835. In 1830, under the duties last mentioned, the imports from the West Indies were more than $21\frac{1}{2}$ millions of pounds; those from the East Indies less than a million. From that time, although the demand went on increasing, the power of supply possessed by the West Indies showed itself to be exhausted and even overpassed. In 1832 the quantity taken for consumption from the West Indies was less than 21 millions of pounds, while that from the East Indies, in spite of the differential duty, had come up to nearly 2 million pounds, or in two years had doubled. For three years more, the same results were exhibited, the demand and the price rising and the supply from the protected regions decreasing. In 1835, the West Indies sent only $14\frac{1}{2}$ millions of pounds, while they had sent 22 millions the year before. The enhanced price, how-

ever, enabling the producers in the East Indies better to meet the differential duty directed against them, the quantity of East Indian coffee (including, of course, Ceylon and Singapore) taken into consumption in Great Britain in 1835 was upwards of $5\frac{1}{2}$ millions of pounds. Nevertheless, the whole imports of that year were only $20\frac{1}{4}$ millions of pounds, while five years before (1830) the consumption had been $21\frac{1}{2}$ millions of pounds. A single sentence expresses the sum of what we have seen thus far. With an increasing population, and a demand, as has since been shown, increasing in a much greater ratio, there was a decreasing supply of this wholesome, harmless, and home-keeping beverage; and the production in that portion of our colonial territories which was favoured at the expense of the other portions was rapidly withering away. This last result may seem beyond the power even of the blighting influence of monopoly, but it has to be remembered that, besides the direct effect of protection in inducing carelessness and cost, it had also an indirect effect by the protection on sugar happening to be proportionally somewhat greater than that upon coffee, which led the planters to employ, in the production of sugar, lands of a nature naturally better fitted for the production of coffee. This fact was admitted by Mr. Higgins (who, under the name of "Jacob Omnium," used to act as the great literary champion of the West Indian interest) in his evidence before the Colonial Distress Committee of 1848. Having thus been unjust to a large portion of our own possessions, and cruel to our own consumers, only to find that we had done harm to the interest for whose benefit all this injustice and folly was supposed to be perpetrated, it is not to be wondered at that the legislature should at this time have begun to doubt its own wisdom.

Comparatively apathetic and uninformed as public opinion was at that time on commercial questions, it began to be seen that the system, breaking down with its own rottenness, could no longer be upheld without some concession to justice and sense. Accordingly, in September, 1835, the legislature, 'slowly wise and meanly just,' passed an Act admitting East India coffee at the same duty as West India (6*d.* per lb.), the duty on Foreign being still maintained at a prohibitory rate. Under the relaxed system the supply rose in 1836 to nearly 19 million lbs. from the West Indies, and 5 million lbs. from the East, or 24 millions; the supply in the year preceding having been, as we have seen, only $20\frac{1}{4}$ million lbs. In 1837, the West Indian supply fell again to $15\frac{1}{2}$ million lbs., and the total supply stood at $25\frac{1}{4}$, above which it rose very little in 1838, although the West Indian supply that year increased by 2

millions. It will thus be seen that the extension of the source of supply under the alteration of 1835, was not only failing to meet the demand, but scarcely sufficed to keep the supply at its former level. And it is necessary now to mention that even this supply, inadequate as it was, was obtained in no inconsiderable part by a permitted evasion of the protective system. The duty on Foreign coffee was 1*s.* 3*d.* per lb., which was virtually prohibitory; but as the duty was levied according to the port from which the produce was shipped, without reference to the country where it had been grown, it became a custom more and more brought into operation as the demand and price increased, to take Foreign coffee to some of the ports of our Eastern possessions, or to the Cape of Good Hope, unship it, re-ship it, and so get it passed at the duty leviable on East India coffee. When the duties on East Indian were made level with West Indian, and the supply still remained inadequate to the demand, this barbarous offshoot of a barbarous system of course greatly increased; and attempts were made to check or regulate it, as by admitting Foreign coffee from certain parts at 9*d.* per lb. In 1839, of 13 million lbs. paying duty as East Indian, $8\frac{3}{4}$ millions were the produce of foreign soils. In 1840, although the West Indian produce had fallen below 10 million lbs., the total consumption rose to $28\frac{3}{4}$ millions; but of this upwards of 14 millions was Foreign entered as East Indian, while the actual East Indian was only $4\frac{1}{2}$ millions. In 1841, the supply was again $28\frac{3}{4}$ millions, of which 11 millions were Foreign transhipped; and in 1842, $28\frac{1}{2}$ millions, of which $11\frac{1}{4}$ were Foreign. Let us again, so to speak, take stock. After having seen that we were driven by languishing supplies to put the East Indies on the same footing as the West, we see that we were next driven by the same cause to admit foreign countries by a sort of costly and clumsy back-door.

Now came Sir Robert Peel's first reform of the tariff, under which the duty on Foreign coffee was reduced to 8*d.*, and that on colonial to 4*d.* per lb. This, though still a protection of 37*s.* 6*d.* a cwt., simplified and improved matters considerably. In 1843, the total consumption was 30 million lbs., of which 20 were of British Possessions, and 10 Foreign. In 1844, although the alteration scarcely came into effect till 1845, the duties on Foreign were reduced to 6*d.* and the duty on Colonial to 4*d.*; and in April, 1851, the duties were brought to their present level of 3*d.* on all kinds. We construct a table, showing the duties on both kinds of coffee, the amount of British, the amount of Foreign, and the total amount consumed, in each year since 1843, that being the year in which there came into

operation the first adjustment of duties which can be said to have been made for the benefit of the consumer; but before it we place the figures of the immediately preceding year, 1842, the last under the old system, and whose figures, as we have seen, are much the same as those of the four years again preceding:—

| Year. | Duties. | British consumed. | Foreign consumed. | Total. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | lbs. | lbs. | lbs. |
| 1842 | - - | 17,299,916 | 11,219,730 | 28,519,644 |
| 1843 | 8*d.* & 4*d.* | 20,130,630 | 9,848,774 | 29,974,404 |
| 1844 | do. | 19,553,624 | 11,815,758 | 31,352,282 |
| 1845 | 6*d.* & 4*d.* | 20,792,859 | 13,500,331 | 34,293,190 |
| 1846 | do. | 23,794,782 | 12,986,609 | 36,781,391 |
| 1847 | do. | 27,030,907 | 10,439,672 | 37,470,579 |
| 1848 | do. | 30,146,707 | 6,959,585 | 37,106,292 |
| 1849 | do. | 29,769,730 | 4,661,344 | 34,431,074 |
| 1850 | do. | 28,891,294 | 2,335,546 | 31,226,840 |
| 1851* | 6*d.* 4*d.* & 3*d.* | 27,996,516 | 4,567,648 | 32,564,164 |
| 1852* | 3*d.* | 27,722,806 | 7,321,570 | 35,044,570 |
| 1853* | do. | 28,149,482 | 8,942,332 | 37,091,814 |

There are two points of view from which this table, and also the figures preceding (which, owing to the changes in the classification of the commodity at different periods, could not be cast into a tabular form) require to be regarded, — in their relation to the protected or once protected interests, and in their relation to the consumer. On the first point, there is neither room nor motive for denying that the coffee production of the West Indies has shown a rapid decline; but the figures and other facts of the history, into which we cannot venture in detail, bring out with perfect clearness these points:— 1st, That the decay of West Indian production had for many years been going on under the most rigid Protection at least as rapidly as it has done since the relaxation and subsequent downfall of the system. 2nd, That the West Indian coffee-growers have been supplanted in the market, not by foreigners (whose imports during the last six years have been actually less by more than a half than they had been on the average of the six years preceding the removal of the 1*s.* 3*d.* prohibitory duty, and the transhipment system), but by their brother colonists in the

* The equalisation of duties took place on 15th April, 1851, consequently that year is partly under the protective duty of 2*d.* (6*d.* and 4*d.*) and partly under the equal duties; and after that date the entries at the custom-house do not distinguish the place of growth, but only the place of shipment.

East Indies, and chiefly Ceylon;—in 1835, before the equalisation on West Indian and East Indian, the imports from Ceylon were only 1,870,143 lbs.; they were 35,640,658 lbs. in 1849! 3rd, That even on the principle of Protection, there is not a shadow of reason why the West Indies should be protected at the expense of the East. 4th, That the West Indians were, we have amply seen, not exposed to fair competition even with their brother colonists till it was found, after every device of Protection had been expended for their benefit, that, in spite of the increasing need and demands of consumers, the supplies were languishing and decaying. Then as to production in the East, need we do more than point back to the fact which we have just had occasion incidentally to mention, that the coffee production of Ceylon (which forms more than nine-tenths of the whole Eastern supplies) has, since 1835, undergone the enormous increase of ten or fifteen-fold? In 1848, when Lord George Bentinck was proving and 'resolving' in his Committee that the Ceylon growers were ruined, they sent home 30,500,000 lbs., although they had never, previously to 1842, produced 8,000,000! And next year, when the ruin should have been completed and fully manifest, they sent home 35,500,000 lbs.! The truth on this part of the case may be learned at a glance, by looking at the first of the tables we have given, where (although the confusion arising from the classification being made at some periods according to the place of production, and at others according to the place of export, causes some little disparity) the effect is brought out plainly that, just since the admission of the foreign article at non-prohibitory and subsequently at equal duties, the consumption of colonial coffee as a whole, but more especially of East Indian, has gone on increasing, and that of foreign decaying. In further illustration, let us give the figures relating to the two years preceding the lowering of the duty on foreign coffee, (Sir Robert Peel's first tariff reform,) and those for the two years last elapsed, in which all kinds of coffee have been liable to the same duties:—

| | Protection. | | Free Trade. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1841. | 1842. | 1852. | 1853. |
| | lbs. | lbs. | lbs. | lbs. |
| British coffee consumed - - | 17,532,448 | 17,299,916 | 27,722,806 | 28,149,482 |
| Foreign do. do. | 10,833,969 | 11,219,730 | 7,321,570 | 8,942,332 |

It may be desirable to explain that in 1841-2 the foreign coffee had been transhipped at East Indian ports or the Cape, and that in 1852-3 the classification refers to the place of shipment and not of growth, that distinction having ceased at the custom-house since the equalisation of the duties in April, 1851. But, making all due allowance for the want of precision arising from these causes, there is evidence enough that, so far from the colonist having been beaten by the foreigner, he has, since the opening of the market, beaten the foreigner out of a great part of the field he occupied under Protection.

On the mode in which the various changes in the legislative 'management' of the coffee trade have affected the consumer—*i. e.*, the public—it is not necessary to add much to what has appeared with sufficient clearness and prominence in the course of the narrative. It will be seen that, until 1842, the consumer cannot be said to have been made any account of;—that the people of the United Kingdom should get the article of coffee in sufficient quantity and at fair prices, cannot be regarded as having been the object of any of the many changes on the coffee duties previous to that date. At first, the object of the legislature was to 'protect' the West Indies against the East Indies, and then both Indies together against the foreigners—the public, of course, paying for all. The figures, however, of the years preceding 1842 do not show the full extent to which the protective system tended to check the consumption. Previous to 1835, several changes had been made on the duties, still maintaining the protection in all its rigour, but letting in the favoured West Indian produce at a reduced duty; next, between 1835 and 1842, a vast quantity of foreign came in, as we have seen, by the evasive process of transhipment, which co-operated with the equalisation of duties on all kinds of colonial. The severity of the system was thus somewhat mitigated. Aided by these changes—the reduction of duties on the gross, the partial evasion of the duties on foreign, and the equalisation of the duties on the two sorts of colonial—the consumption rose from 21,700,000 lbs. in 1821 to 28,500,000 lbs. in 1842—that is, about 30 per cent. in 21 years. But the change of 1842, the first made with almost any reference to the consumers, and which was but a small approach towards Free Trade, raised the consumption to 37,500,000 lbs. in 1847, being more than 25 per cent. in *five* years! Since then, we have had what, but for one simple explanation, might, under the circumstances, be called the *anomaly* of a decline. That explanation is the rise of the process of adulteration; or perhaps we should rather say, for such it really is, the rise of a popular taste for chicory.

That practice and taste existed previous to 1847, but it was only subsequent to that year that they arose to an extent which seems incredible to any that have not made inquiry among those engaged in the trade. That the decline of the last four years in the use of genuine coffee is ascribable to this cause only, and not to diminished powers of purchase, is proved by the great increase during the same period in the use of concomitant articles, even, as we are about next to show, of articles that have not, like coffee, been themselves cheapened; and also by the very conclusive fact that the year of greatest consumption, the culminating point, was 1847, the year of greatest distress and penury. This element of adulteration, or change of taste, somewhat impairs the statistics of the coffee trade as a test or measurement of the effects of Free Trade. But much more than enough remains without deduction or doubt, to prove that here too, in what proved an attempt as illusory as it was unjust to benefit certain classes of producers, immense wrong was done to the consumers by Protection, and immense benefit received by its removal.

Coming next to the still more important article of TEA, we have to deal with two distinct periods in its history. We have to look, first, at the effects upon its consumption of the change from Monopoly to Free Trade effected eighteen years ago, and then at the effects produced by the introduction of Free Trade into the common articles of food and the commercial code generally in 1846 (with, perhaps, a glance backwards to the first tariff reform in 1842).

Fortunately—that is, fortunately if Protection had not ceased to be the principle of our commercial legislation,—we have no soil of our own for growing tea, either at home or in the colonies, on behalf of which we could create, according to what was so long our wont, a vicious system of protective and prohibitory duties, ultimately injurious to the producer, and always burdensome to the consumer. But, in the absence of any existing or natural temptation towards this folly, we invented an artificial one. Having no class of our community to whom we could give a monopoly in growing the commodity, we gave to the East India Company a monopoly of buying, carrying, and selling it. In this way we accomplished what it would seem justifiable to call the *desired* work of producing scarcity and dearness, almost as effectually as if we had had the misfortune to grow tea within any portion of our own dominions. Acting in conjunction with the commercial monopoly, was a high duty, levied for revenue, but, as in every case where a tax is levied on a protected or monopolised article, operating much more as a

burden to the tax-payer than a benefit to the Treasury. In ordinary cases of Protection, the process consists in the protected interest pocketing the difference between the duty on their own article and that upon the foreign article, the whole supply of the commodity being made as dear to the consumer as if the whole paid the foreign duty, while the Treasury gets only what is generally but a mere driblet. In this particular instance the operation was somewhat different, but very simple, and the result much the same. The East India Company, being the only merchants and carriers permitted to deal in the article, for a long series of years sold tea in London (the only port where it was permitted to be imported) at *double* the price at which the same article was sold at the same time in Hamburg; and, the duty being *ad valorem*, the public were made by the monopoly to pay, not only double price, but double duty! From 1803 to the fall of the monopoly in 1834, that is, for thirty years, the duty, frequently varied in form, may be stated at 100 per cent. on the natural or world's market price of the article; and, by the process just explained, it was made, in reality, 200 per cent. The alterations, both on the form and amount of the duty, were numerous, almost from the time the article came first into general use; but it is not necessary to complicate the question by going back beyond 1805, when a duty was imposed, which, though making some attempt at discrimination as to qualities, may be stated at 100 per cent. on the natural value; and this was continued without material alteration till the fall of the monopoly in 1834. This duty — nominally 100, and actually 200 per cent., — was enormous on an article in general use; and under it the consumption, taking population into account, languished and declined for the thirty years of which we have made mention. And this result must be taken in connection with the fact, that in the latter years of the monopoly the East India Company tried the effects of a reduction in price, mainly in the hope of making more profit by selling an increased quantity at a lower rate than a smaller quantity at a higher, and partly, perhaps, to clear off their stocks before the opening of the trade; so that, if we did not bring the figures so far down, but excluded this period of voluntary reduction in price, we should find a still worse result, the quantity scarcely increasing at all, even without reckoning the increase of population. But let us go on. In 1805 the consumption was 24,293,092 lbs., and in 1833 it was 31,289,620 lbs., — an increase of considerably less than a third. But, in the same time, the population of the United Kingdom had increased from 15,963,349 (in 1801) to 24,132,294 in 1831; which, as the

increase of population was greater in the period between 1831 and 1834 than between 1801 and 1804, must be taken as an increase of a half. We thus find, that the combined effects of monopoly and taxation had, in spite of a growing taste for the article, reduced every man's share. During the same period of thirty years, the consumption of coffee—in the monopoly and taxation of which there had been, as we have seen, various modifications,—increased by more than twentyfold, the quantity consumed in 1805 having been 1,061,327 lbs., and 22,932,527 in 1833. In this fact—(from which, however, a deduction must be made on account of the popular taste for coffee having at that period grown more rapidly than that for tea)—we get at once an indication of the amount of privation inflicted by the tea monopoly, and of that increasing pressure upon coffee, before which *its* monopoly fell piecemeal away.

In 1834 the monopoly ended, and the *ad valorem* duty was succeeded by a fixed duty of 1*s.* 6*d.*, 2*s.* 2*d.*, and 3*s.* per lb., levied according to the classification or character of the teas. The exact date of the change was the 22nd of April, 1834. We give the imports in the year ending that day, and those for the year which ended that day twelvemonths, to mark the effect of the change or of its commencement:—

1833-4, the last year of the monopoly, 29,592,310 lbs.
1834-5, the first year of open trade, 41,041,843 lbs.

The quantity entered for consumption in the latter year was between 35 and 36 millions of lbs., between 5 and 6 millions of lbs. being withheld or re-exported: for one of the benefits of the change was, that thenceforth this country, besides getting more, and better, and cheaper tea for herself, became to a great extent a depôt for the supply of Europe, the quantity, for instance, re-exported in 1852 being above 6 millions of lbs. Now this instantaneous increase of supply and consumption is striking and instructive enough in itself, but we shall not have learned all that it teaches unless we also mark that, instead of diminishing the revenue, the change raised it by about half a million sterling. Here, then, we see that the very moment the heavy hand of Monopoly was removed our people got more tea, and our Treasury more money. At mention of such facts the question naturally springs up, Why then the monopoly?—what were the benefits of that system of which we so plainly see the evils? That is a question which thrusts itself forward regarding every monopoly of which we have got rid, and which no man can satisfactorily answer.

In 1835 (from January to December) 44,366,550 lbs. of tea

were imported, and 36,574,000 passed for consumption. In 1836, 49,307,701 lbs. were imported, and 49,142,236 taken for consumption; but in that year (1st July), the duty was altered from the three rates fixed in 1833 to 2*s.* 1*d.* per lb. on all kinds of tea, at which it remained till Mr. Gladstone's reduction last year. This change led to the lower qualities—which under the then lapsing duties were only liable to 1*s.* 6*d.* per lb.—being passed the custom-house in much greater quantities than needed for immediate consumption. The effects of this are to be seen in the quantities entered for consumption, which had thus risen a third in this single year, falling, the next two years, below the point from which they had risen in 1835 (the quantities in 1837 and 1838 being respectively 30,625,206 and 32,366,412 lbs.). The average, however, of the three years whose statistics were disturbed by the incident just mentioned was 37,377,951 lbs., which is greater than the consumption of any preceding year, and showed the increase going on unchecked.

After this period, we have to look at the history of the consumption of this article as affected, not by alterations on the duties to which it was subject—for these remained unaltered from 1836 till April of last year—but only by the general state of the country, which was powerfully influenced, as we have seen and shall see, by the removal of the monopolies existing in other articles. In 1839, the quantity of tea taken for consumption was 35,136,232 lbs.; in 1840, it went down to 32,262,905 lbs., the effect of a year of high grain prices and bad trade. When we mention that the imperial average price of wheat in these years was 66*s.* 4*d.* and 70*s.* 8*d.* per quarter, we explain the stagnation or decrease in the consumption of tea at that period —it was as much the effect, though the indirect effect, of monopoly, as if the East Indian Company's charter had been still intact—the people were mulcted in their tea for the benefit of the owners of corn-growing land. In 1841, bread prices were somewhat lower and trade better, and the consumption of tea rose again to 36,675,667 lbs.; in 1842 (wheat 57*s.* 3*d.*), to 37,355,911 lbs.; in 1843 (wheat 50*s.* 1*d.*), 40,293,393 lbs.; in 1844 (wheat 51*s.* 3*d.*), 41,363,770 lbs.; in 1845 (wheat 50*s.* 10*d.*), 44,193,433 lbs.; in 1846 (wheat 57*s.*), 46,728,208 lbs.; in 1847—the consumption being scarcely checked even by the commercial revulsion and the temporary high prices of bread —46,324,298 lbs. The consumption of the years following, down to the present time—being the period during which the country may be held as having been under the influence of the

repeal of the Corn and Sugar Monopolies and the other Free Trade measures—we give in a tabular form: —

| Year. | lbs. | Year. | lbs. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1848 | 48,735,971 | 1851 | 53,965,112 |
| 1849 | 50,024,688 | 1852 | 54,724,615 |
| 1850 | 51,178,715 | 1853 | 58,860,127 |

It has to be noted, however, that a reduction of duty from 2*s.* 2*d.* to 1*s.* 10*d.* per lb. took place in April last year. It may be also proper to repeat the explanation that the above figures do not, as in the case of sugar, represent an increase of consumption under a change of system directly affecting the article itself, but only under a change of system which, by reducing the price of bread, sugar, and other necessaries, enabled the population to make greater purchases of articles like this. But in looking backward for a moment to see what we have gained, let us not leave quite out of the view the removal of the monopoly in the article itself effected in 1834. We have already seen that under the system of monopoly, the consumption during the thirty years 1803-33, increased only by seven millions of pounds. In the twenty years preceding the abolition of the monopoly, the average annual increase in the consumption of tea was 230,000 lbs.; during the twenty years of open trade, the average annual increase was 1,200,000 lbs.—so that the rate of increase has been magnified nearly *six-fold.* In this we see the effects of the breaking up of the monopoly, combined, in the period comprised, with the effects of the application of Free Trade to other articles. Let us try (though of course the process must be somewhat rough) to distinguish between the effects of these two causes. For this purpose we may be allowed to divide the nineteen years (we exclude last year as in part influenced by Mr. Gladstone's reduction) that have elapsed since the removal of the East India Company's monopoly into two periods, excluding 1835, the first year of the open system, in order to make the periods equal, and making the division between 1843 and 1844, which, as about half way between the tariff reform of 1842 and the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846, may be taken as marking off that period when the growth of the tea trade was influenced solely by the removal of the East India Company's monopoly, from that period when it was influenced also by the freedom of trade and reduction of price in the

other great articles of consumption. The number of cwts. taken for consumption was—

| | Cwts. |
|---|---|
| In the first period - - - | 2,771,713 |
| In the second period - - - | 3,903,917 |

If we take the consumption per head of the population, the growth seems still more large and rapid. In the thirty years following 1805, we have already seen the consumption per head did not increase at all, but declined.

In 1831, the population of 24,029,702 consumed 29,997,101 lbs. of tea, being less than $1\frac{2}{3}$ lb. per head.

In 1843, the population of somewhat less than twenty-seven millions took 40,293,393 lbs. of tea, being somewhat more than $1\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. per head.

In 1852 (which we take in preference to 1853, because a change of duty took place during the course of the latter year), the population of 27,452,262 took 54,725,000lbs., being 2 lbs. per head.

And in 1853, the consumption was 58,860,127 lbs., or about $2\frac{1}{7}$ lbs. per head.

The revenue from tea, which was 3,410,000*l.* in 1833, the last year in the East India Company's monopoly, was 4,407,641*l.* in 1843, and was 5,985,482*l.* in 1852.

The sum and results of Free Trade in the article of tea may be stated in the form of two facts, the effect of which we would not weaken by further comment. *The people are consuming nearly double the quantity of tea per head;* and *the Treasury is* (or was) *receiving nearly double the amount of revenue.*

In the smaller, though not unimportant article of Cocoa, we have similar results. Previous to 1842, the duties on this article were 6*d.* per lb. on foreign, and 2*d.* on British; they were then altered to 4*d.* and 1*d.*, and are now 2*d.* and 1*d.* In 1841, the quantity taken for consumption was 1,928,847 lbs.; in 1843, 2,547,943; in 1853, 4,126,687.

The next article which we take—Tobacco—differs from any with which we have hitherto been dealing, in the duties upon it having scarcely at any time, and not at all for a long period past, been levied with any other object than the legitimate one of raising a revenue, and in being neither a necessary of life, nor an admittedly wholesome luxury, and any increase on which, therefore, except as marking increased powers of purchase among the masses, is not unquestionable or unmixed matter of rejoicing. For forty years previous to 1826, the duties on tobacco had been undergoing very frequent changes, a discrimination being maintained between tobacco imported from our

American possessions, and that imported from the dominions of Spain and Portugal, and between that imported into Great Britain and that imported into Ireland. In 1826, there being, in fact, scarcely any colonial tobacco to protect, the duties were equalised and fixed at the rates at which they still remain, viz., 3*s.* per lb. on unmanufactured, and 9*s.* per lb. on manufactured (cigars, &c.), without regard to place of growth or importation. The importations of tobacco in the manufactured form, liable to the three-fold duty, are so trifling in amount—notwithstanding the immense extent to which cigars professing to be *not* home-made are now notoriously used—that for the present we may lay them out of view. For ten years previous to 1826, the consumption of unmanufactured tobacco in the United Kingdom had averaged between sixteen and seventeen millions of lbs. In 1827, the first year of the equalised duties, it was 18,745,827 lbs., and the revenue was 2,826,739*l.*; in 1841, which we take as the year preceding the first introduction of Free Trade into our tariff, the quantity taken for consumption was 22,309,360 lbs., and the revenue 3,580,164*l.*; in 1852, the quantity taken for consumption was 28,358,908 lbs., and the revenue 4,560,831*l.* The quantity of the manufactured article entered for consumption, at its duty of 9*s.*, has remained at somewhat above 200,000 lbs. per annum for the last ten years. It will be seen from the figures just given, that the increase between 1841 and 1852—that is, during the Free Trade era—is more than a fourth, while the population within the same period has increased only one-twenty-seventh, so that the increase in the consumption of tobacco per head cannot be taken at less than a fourth—an increase without precedent during the period of the existence of the present duties. The following figures show the consumption per head of tobacco in the United Kingdom in each of the four decennial periods:—

| Year. | Ounces. | Year. | Ounces. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1821 | 11·77 | 1841 | 13·36 |
| 1831 | 12·85 | 1851 | 16·27 |

The consumption now, so far as can be inferred from the figures of last year, is about 4 oz. per head more than in 1841, being an increase of about 30 per cent. on the last ten years. Such a result in the case of a commodity taxed 1200 per cent. is a strong testimony to the improved means of the masses, not-

withstanding the drawback to the gratification arising from the dubious or semi-pernicious nature of the article.

The article of WINES, which many people will regard as objectionable as tobacco as a test of improved comfort, has remained under the same duties as at present for more than twenty years; namely, 5*s.* 6*d.* a gallon on foreign, and 2*s.* 9*d.* on Cape. The difference between the two duties is intended as a protection to the execrable product of our African colony; but the result is so insignificant—colonial wine forming only about a twenty-fourth part of the total consumption, and having fallen off more than a half within these twenty years—that, for brevity's and clearness' sake, we shall let this little bit of protection drop out of sight, and confine our view solely to the increase which has taken place on the foreign wines under the indirect influence of that system whose effects we are investigating. Previous to 1831 the rates of duty had been frequently varied, on the principle of taxing French wines higher than Peninsular or German; and the duties had from the beginning of the century been on the whole very considerably higher than the present rates. One consequence was, that the consumption of wine was actually less at the end of the first quarter of the current century than it had been ten years before the century began. In 1792 the quantity taken for consumption was 8,082,249 gallons; but as that was under a rate of duty somewhat lower than has ever been exacted since, we may take the year 1808, when, under duties much higher than the present, the consumption was 6,408,534 gallons. In 1830, the year before the introduction of the present duties, the consumption was 5,676,771 gallons (it had been still higher the year before); the alteration of that year was not a lowering but only an equalising, and in fact a raising of the duty—as French wine, the duty on which was reduced from 7*s.* 3*d.* to 5*s.* 6*d.*, at that time only supplied about a twentieth part of the whole foreign supply, while on the other nineteen-twentieths the duty was *raised* from 4*s.* 10*d.* to 5*s.* 6*d.* In 1832, the consumption under the new uniform duty was down to 5,199,203 gallons; in 1841 it was 5,743,722 gallons; in 1853 it was 7,197,522 gallons. While there is in these figures ample reason to conclude that the duty is too high, we see that, under the same duties, the increase was not much more than half a million of gallons in the ten years preceding the first beginnings of Free Trade, and has been not much less than a million of gallons in the ten years following that event, although the increase of population was three times greater in the former decade than in the latter. The rate of increase, such as it is, in the consumption of wine, has thus,

on the lowest mode of computation, been doubled by the influence of general free trade.

On the article of SPIRITS, home and foreign, we shall say but little—partly because, except in some disputed points about adjusting the duties on colonial rum to those on home-made spirits, the duties may be said to have, at least for a considerable period, been levied both on home and foreign only on the principle of getting as great as possible an amount of revenue, with as small as possible an amount of encouragement to smuggling; partly because a detail of the many and complicated changes of duty resorted to with this view would be tedious, and apart from our present object; and partly because an increase or decline in the consumption of spirits is by no means a fair index to the condition of the people, seeing that an increase may mean only a deterioration, and a decrease only an improvement, of habits. We shall, therefore, only mention that in 1832 the consumption of all kinds of spirits in the United Kingdom was 26,462,058 gallons; in 1842 it had fallen to 22,050,928 gallons; but, as the statistics of that and the following year were disturbed by Sir Robert Peel's abortive attempt to add 1*s.* a gallon to the duty on Irish whisky, which led to a decline in the legal and an increase in the illegal distillation, we must take as the figures really presenting the consumption of the middle period of the twenty years with which we are dealing, those for 1841, viz. 24,124,921 gallons—a decrease of more than two millions of gallons in these ten years of Protection. In 1852 (we do not take 1853, because alterations both on the Scotch and the Irish duties took place during the currency of the year) the consumption was 30,052,284 gallons, being an increase of nearly six millions of gallons during the ten years of Free Trade. And, along with these figures, we must take into account that the population increased largely in the first decade and little or not at all in the second. The following figures show the consumption per head of spirits of each kind—viz. British (whisky and gin), Foreign (brandy and Geneva), and Colonial (rum) in each of the three years named:—

| Year. | British. | Colonial. | Foreign. |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Gallons. | Gallons. | Gallons. |
| 1831 | 0·90 | 0·15 | 0·050 |
| 1841 | 0·77 | 0·09 | 0·044 |
| 1851 | 0·87 | 0·10 | 0·066 |

These years are taken because, being the years of the de-

cennial census, they afford the most correct means of ascertaining the consumption per head; but it may be mentioned that in last year (1853) the consumption of British spirits was greater than in 1851 by 1,044,721 gallons, and of all kinds together there was an increase about 4 per cent., but an actual though very slight decrease as compared with 1852. Without entering on the discussion of sundry points which these figures might raise, we may state that, if some consolation is needed for the fact that the nation is drinking rather more per head now than ten years ago, it may be found in the accompanying facts that still we drink less than we did *twenty* years ago, and that, while on articles of a less questionable nature, even those on which the fiscal exactions have not been lightened, we have seen during the last ten years increases varying from 50 to 100 per cent., the increased consumption of intoxicating liquors during the same period has been only one-tenth.

A similar result is to be seen in the case of BEER, so far as that can be measured by the quantity of malt brought to duty, though, as a small portion of malt goes to the manufacture of spirits, the test is not perfectly accurate. In 1831, the quantity of malt charged with duty in the United Kingdom was 5,039,360 quarters; in 1841, 4,520,541 quarters; in 1851, 5,042,100 quarters. In 1853, the quantity was 5,254,923. It would thus appear that, though we are drinking a little more beer than we drank in 1841, we are scarcely drinking any more than in 1831.

Having now completed our examination of the growth of consumption in the chief articles of meat and drink, produced by the invigorating and cheapening influences of Free Trade, let us try to present some of the more important results in a vidimus:—

CONSUMPTION PER HEAD AT THE PERIODS NAMED.

| | 1833. | 1843. | 1853. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bread, stated in bushels of Wheat - | 8 | 8 | 10½ |
| Sugar in lbs. - - - - | 18 | 16 | 30 |
| Coffee in ounces - - - | 14 | 16 | 20½ |
| Tea in ounces - - - | 19 | 22 | 34 |

Or, to state it less arithmetically, Free Trade has

*Added nearly a third to our Bread,*
*Nearly doubled our Sugar,*
*Added a third to our Coffee,*
*And nearly doubled our Tea.*

Read with reflection these figures, even as they stand unaided by explanation or enforcement, convey great facts and teach glad

lessons. But once more we must call to mind the fact that the full reach and meaning of the change we have seen accomplished, or rather begun, cannot be brought out by any figures which necessarily show only the gross increase, or the increase per head when spread over the whole population. It is on the poor that the blessing has chiefly come, and come bounteously. Those who once had none have now some—those who once had too little have now enough. To all who can perceive the true significance of such figures as these, they tell a tale of no ordinary and no vulgar interest — they tell of millions of tables replenished that were bare, and millions of hearths brightened that were black — of comfort brought to those who were striving with despair, and health to those that were ready to perish. They show that, in sending forth those measures whose influences we have been tracing, the British legislature virtually said — almost as potently as if it had been spoken from above — to the famished, "Be ye filled," and to those that were stinted and fearing, "Eat thy bread with joy and drink thy wine with a merry heart."

If it had been practicable here to have carried our inquiries onward over the whole field — from food and drink to clothing, shipping, revenue, exports, pauperism, crime, and vital statistics — we should have found in every department the facts and symptoms at which we have been looking paralleled and corroborated. With what, then, shall we conclude as the sum of the whole matter? If statistics beyond question, and facts that thrust themselves on every man's every-day observation and experience, are in aught to be believed, we have it demonstrated and manifest that within these ten years, and especially within these last five, we have made greater advances in prosperity than at any period known in our commercial and social history; and that the benefits of the new era have been obtained in largest proportion, and in larger proportion than at any preceding period, by the great body of the people.

There is still, however, one other point of view from which our progress and position ought to be contemplated. The emancipation of commerce has not only brought in benefit upon us in a ratio of increase never before known in our own history; but in the great essentials that go to make a happy and a prosperous community, it has placed us much more unquestionably than before above all our neighbours. It would be painful as well as foolish to assume that the condition of our people is all that it ought to be or that it will be — that we have "touched the highest point of all our greatness;" but we can at least assert that we are not only better off than ever we were before, but that we are, as may be said, incomparably better off than

our neighbours, to whom in soil and sky nature has been kinder, and who shut out the competition we invite. We can stand up before all Europe and say, "Here we are, unable to grow in our country a sufficiency of the commonest necessaries of food and clothing — here we are, with our own ports free to all the world, and having to sell the products of our labour in your 'protected' markets; and yet we are better fed, better clad, better paid, than any of you; and the less we have trusted to those restrictions on which you lay your help, the stronger, and happier, and richer, have we become." In spite of all the barriers of protective tariffs, we sell more products than any other country in the world, and therewith we buy for our own use a far greater abundance of all things, from the commonest necessaries to the most costly luxuries, that are produced by all other climates. Never more than by this country at this time was exemplified the truth of that wise remark which Sir Josiah Child uttered centuries ago: — "They that can give the best price for a commodity shall never fail to have it by one means or other, notwithstanding the opposition of any laws, or interposition of any power by sea or land; of such force, subtlety, and violence, is the general course of trade." Nor ever did the striking, if after the manner of his day somewhat quaint, lines of Edmund Waller, depicting the reach and the fruits of English commerce under the Commonwealth, approach so near to the strict reality than now when that commerce has been emancipated and re-invigorated: —

> 'As Egypt does not on the clouds rely,
> But to the Nile owes more than to the sky,
> So what our earth and what our heaven denies,
> Our ever constant friend the sea supplies.
>
> 'The taste of hot Arabia's spice we know,
> Free from the scorching sun that makes it grow;
> Without the worm, in Persian silks we shine,
> And, without planting, drink of every vine.
>
> 'To dig for wealth we weary not our limbs;
> Gold, though the heaviest metal, hither swims;
> Ours is the harvest where the Indians mow,
> We plough the deep, and reap what others sow.'

---

The unmixed satisfaction which we should derive from a contemplation of the successful working, on a large scale, of the beneficent principles of Free Trade, and of the national and social advantages which it has produced to this country, as exhi-

bited in the preceding pages, is troubled by the painful recollection that the advent of an European war threatens to derange the operations of commerce, and, for a time, to close up some of its channels. Being ourselves destitute of all faith in the theory of commercial independence, and not admitting the advantages of national isolation for purposes of trade, we look without apprehension to a state of war, even with the powerful empire of Russia, as likely to impede our supplies of important articles of consumption.

> 'Aurum per medios ire satellites,
> Et perrumpere amat saxa, potentius
> Ictu fulmineo.'

Partial losses may be sustained, and temporary inconveniences may be suffered, but the resources of modern trade will triumph over all obstacles. It is not from the direct operation of war that we anticipate an interruption of our commercial relations. It is not from diminished supplies of hemp and tallow from the northern ports, or of corn from the Black Sea, that we expect any national losses to accrue. The real danger to our trade lies, not in the war with Russia itself, but in its incidental consequences. It lies, not in our rupture with the hostile power, but in our new relations with pacific and neutral powers. The wealth of England mainly consists in the annual produce of its native industry, and that constant source of wealth will be partially dried up, if the surplus of our manufactures cannot be exchanged for the great supplies of food, and other articles of consumption, which we import from foreign countries. So long as our internal production proceeds at its present rate, and our vast external trade can be maintained undiminished, there will be adequate funds for supporting, though not without sacrifice, a great and expensive war. A large and well paid revenue is the first condition for efficient fleets and armies; and it is only by guarding our trade from all incidental and unnecessary causes of decline, that our national resources, and our means of fiscal contribution, can be preserved unimpaired. It is the paramount interest of England to keep the highways of trade open and secure.

The rights of search for enemy's goods, and for British seamen, which England has asserted in time of war, have always been sources of irritation with neutral powers, and have involved us in disputes with nations, strangers to the original grounds of quarrel; have impeded our trade, multiplied our enemies, augmented our expenses, distracted our military and naval operations, lengthened our hostilities, and diminished our chances of

victory. If our councils were now guided by the same narrow-minded policy which dictated the too-celebrated Orders in Council of 1807, we do not doubt that we should speedily find ourselves at war, not only with the United States, as we were in 1812, but even with France; that our friendly relations with all neutral nations would be disturbed; and that our trade would receive a shock from which it would not easily or quickly recover. It was, therefore, with the most sincere satisfaction that we read the recent declaration, by which her Majesty waives the right of seizing enemy's property laden on board a neutral vessel, unless it be contraband of war. Provided that the right of maintaining an effective blockade, and the right of seizing articles contraband of war,—rights which are necessary to a belligerent, and to which no neutral power can reasonably object,—are asserted and exercised, this country has nothing to fear from the concession which has been made. The concession, though expressed in a few words, is, however, most important. It constitutes a great era in the history of our maritime warfare. The assertion of the right, now abandoned, has been supported by a long series of judicial decisions; it has produced piles of articles in newspapers and reviews, of pamphlets, books, and state papers; it has engendered angry remonstrances, disputes, and wars. We are satisfied, however, that the decision to waive the right of seizing enemy's goods in neutral vessels, on the commencement of an European war, is a measure of the soundest policy, and that it not only evinces a due respect for the rights of friendly States, but is grounded on a far-sighted regard for the solid interests of England. The doctrine that 'free ships make free goods' has been already embodied in several treaties between particular States: but a general declaration from the first maritime power in the world, which has the most effectual means of enforcing the right of seizure, must ultimately establish the new rule as a universal canon of international law.

The maxim of 'free ship, free goods,' has often been held to imply a correlative maxim of 'enemy's ship, enemy's goods;' or, according to the old French version, 'robe d'ennemi con-'fisque celle d'ami.'* The effect of the latter rule is, that if

* 'There is a great preponderance of modern treaties in favour of the maxim, *free ships, free goods*, sometimes, but not always, connected with the correlative maxim, *enemy ships, enemy goods*.' *Wheaton*, Elements of International Law, vol. ii. ch. 3., which chapter contains a lucid history of the law and practice respecting the rights of neutrals since the middle of the last century. A useful

the goods of a neutral are found in an enemy's ship, they are not restored to the neutral, but become, together with the enemy's goods, the property of the captor, according to the fable of the Stork and the Cranes. Her Majesty, however, declares that 'it is not her intention to claim the confiscation 'of neutral property, not being contraband of war, found on 'board enemy's ships.' While, therefore, this country now admits the maxim of 'free ship, free goods,' it renounces the doctrine of 'enemy's ship, enemy's goods,' and sanctions the restoration of the goods of a neutral captured in an enemy's ship, if proved to be his *bonâ fide* property.

Lastly, her Majesty declares that, being anxious to lessen as much as possible the evils of war, and to restrict its operations to the regularly organised forces of the country, she does not at present intend to issue letters of marque for the commissioning of privateers.

The law of England, as may be supposed, treats as a pirate any English subject who accepts from an enemy letters of marque for the capture of English vessels. It is likewise a misdemeanour for an English subject to accept letters of marque against a State with which we are at peace. But hitherto it has been the practice for the Crown of England to issue to its own subjects letters of marque against a nation with which we were at war, and to authorise private warfare by sea against merchant vessels belonging to the enemy. By land all private warfare is forbidden: the laws of war, as they are now recognised by civilised nations, reduce hostilities on land to a duel between the armies of the contending nations. But by sea a different system has prevailed; and Sir Archibald Alison, after explaining the practice of England during the late war, lays it down that the rules of war by sea can never be assimilated to the rules of war by land, in this respect.

'Humanity would have just reason to rejoice,' he says, 'if it were practicable to establish a similar system of restrained hostility at sea; if the principle of confining the right of capture to public property could be introduced on the one element as well as the other,

---

pamphlet on the Laws of War affecting Commerce and Shipping, has recently been published by Mr. Byerley Thomson, of Jesus College, Cambridge, and a barrister. We may take this opportunity of expressing our satisfaction at the attention which the University of Cambridge is now paying to the study of International Law, evidenced by such publications as the recent edition of Grotius by the accomplished Master of Trinity. There is no department of Political Science in which English writers have done so little as that of the Law of Nations.

and the private merchant were in safety to navigate the deep amidst hostile fleets in the same manner as the carrier at land securely traverses opposing armies. But it has never been found practicable to introduce such a limitation, nor has it ever been attempted, even by the most civilised nations, as a restraint upon their own hostility, however loudly they may sometimes have demanded it as a bridle upon that of their enemies. And when the utter sterility of the ocean, except as forming a highway for the intercourse of mankind, is considered, it does not appear probable, that until the human heart is essentially changed, such an alteration, how desirable soever by the weaker States, ever can be adopted. It may become general when ambition and national rivalry cease to sway the human heart, but not till then.' (*Hist. of Eur.* c. 33.)

In spite of these confident declarations of the Tory historian respecting the unchangeable nature of the human heart on the subject of privateering, and the necessary consequences of the sterility of the ocean, her Majesty has actually announced that she will not, for the present, grant any letters of marque; and therefore the maritime war will be waged against Russia exclusively by ships of the royal navy. By this decision, the laws of war by sea are practically assimilated to those of war by land: for the doctrine of 'contraband of war,' though it may be put in a less technical form, applies to land as well as to sea. No general would allow munitions and stores of war to pass to the enemy by inland communications which he was able to command, but would use every effort to intercept and capture them.*

How far Russia may imitate the forbearance of England, and abstain from private warfare by sea, events will soon show. Russia, indeed, has not the means of equipping many privateers from her own ports; but a rumour has reached us, that the Emperor will issue his letters of marque to the subjects of neutral States, for the purpose of molesting the trade of England, and, we conclude, of France likewise. The law of England prohibits a British subject from accepting letters of marque under such circumstances, and neutral privateering is, according to Vatel, proscribed by the law of nations. 'It is an 'infamous proceeding on the part of foreigners,' he says, 'to 'take out commissions from a prince, in order to commit 'piratical depredations on a nation which is perfectly innocent 'with respect to them.' (b. 3. § 229.) If neutrals accept letters

* The abandonment of the practice of capturing merchant ships, and the consequent assimilation of the laws of war by sea to those of war by land, was advocated by this Journal in the year 1806, in an article on 'The Frauds of the Neutral Flags.' (Vol. viii. p. 13.)

of marque from Russia, England would, if this doctrine be recognised, be justified in treating such privateers as pirates.

After a peace of nearly forty years, England enters upon a European war, with her political and social institutions invigorated by the reforms introduced since 1830, and with her finances placed on a sound basis by the fiscal legislation of the last decad. She at least need not fear that operation of war which, according to an ancient orator, consists in searching out the rotten parts of the political fabric. She enters upon the war reluctantly, and with no ambitious projects of aggrandisement, but from a sense of national obligation; in order to support the weak against the strong; to resist the encroaching policy of an unscrupulous despot, and to protect British interests by maintaining a just equilibrium of power in Europe. She might, a year ago, have formed a convention with Russia for a prospective partition of Turkey, and might subsequently have connived at the silent employment of proper means for accelerating the contingency upon which the convention was to take effect. She has preferred being the defender of the oppressed, to becoming the accomplice of the spoiler. But just wars are not always short and decisive. We must not conceal from ourselves that a Russian war is an enterprise of vast magnitude; that the country is distant and difficult of approach; that its population is large; and that all its resources are wielded by a single ruler,—haughty, unbending, unaccustomed to opposition, unexpectedly foiled in the accomplishment of a favourite project, semi-oriental in his character, forming his plans with the sagacity of an European, and executing them with the recklessness of an Asiatic. Taken in the whole, the circumstances under which we embark in the contest are indeed such as to give us a reasonable assurance of success; but if the hostilities should be of long duration, England will at least be able to remember with satisfaction that, at the very outset, she took effectual measures for diminishing the evils of war, and for bringing it within the influences of rules suited to the advanced civilisation of the age in which we live.

---

## NOTE.

In Art. V. of our last Number, p. 173., we have, through inadvertence, done an injustice to New College at Oxford. In speaking of the foundation of William of Wykeham, we stated that scholars are chosen from Winchester to New College, not by merit, but by favour. It is true that places upon the foundation at Winchester are bestowed

by favour, but we are assured that the admissions from Winchester to New College are determined solely by merit, and that the examinations are conducted on the fairest principles. We owe the correction of an error into which we were undesignedly led to the courtesy of a Fellow of New College.

## ERRATUM.

In No. 201. p. 118. note, for 'that noble foundation,' read 'the noble foundation at Durham.'

*No. CCIII. will be published in July.*

# INDEX.

# INDEX.


B

*Blind, The*, their works and ways, review of books and reports relating to, 61 — 'Eyes and No-eyes,' 61-2 — difficulty those born blind experience of realising what light or colour is, 62-3 — also space and distance, 64 — mental activity of the blind when once thoroughly interested, 65 — difference in the capacities and dispositions of the blind, 65-6 — their deep earnestness of purpose and consciousness of power, evidenced in Milton, 67-8 — their diligence, thoughtfulness, keenness and sensibility of mind and feeling, 68-9 — the blind at the Great Exhibition, 69 — proportion of the blind to the whole population, 69, and *note* — methods of teaching the blind to read, 70 — alphabetical and arbitrary systems, 71, and *note* — Alston's alphabetical system, 71-3, and *extract* — Lucas's arbitrary system, 73-6 — Mr. Frere's arbitrary system, 76-82 — Mr. Moon's system, 82-4 — comparative prices of books printed for the blind, 84 — the intellectual cultivation of the blind, 84-5 — their love of Music, 85 — their method of learning to write, 85 — their ciphering frame, 85-6 — Saunderson, the blind mathematician, 86 — Huber, the blind naturalist of Geneva, 86-7 — remarkable cases of Metcalfe, Davidson, Dr. Moyes, Blacklock, Holman, and other blind men, 87-8 and *notes* — the Blind Asylum in St. George's Fields, 88 — a visit to the work rooms, 89-91 — necessity of fully developing the faculties and powers of the blind, 92-3.

*Buckingham Papers.* See *Russell* (*Lord John*).

C

*Codification*, review of Parliamentary Papers and Mr. C. S. Greaves' pamphlet on, 573 — progress of Codification during the last twenty years, 573-4 — a Digest of the laws approved of by some of the most eminent lawyers of the country, and successive Lord Chancellors, 574 — aversion of the Judges thereto, 574-5 — reasons assigned by them for the objection they take against the proposed Code, 575-7 — those reasons examined, 577-9 — Sir Samuel Romilly's views favourable to a General Digest, 580 — errors of judgment into which the Judges have fallen from not having duly examined the proposed measure, 580-1.

*Consumption of Food* in the United Kingdom. See *United Kingdom*, consumption of food in the.

E

*Ecclesiastical Economy*, Bills relating to, 94—the ecclesiastical revenues, 94-8, and *notes* — their management, 98-9 — a poor clergy not necessarily a virtuous one, 99—actual receipt of a rector whose annual income from the Church is 1000*l.*, 100-1—erroneous notions on the vast wealth of the clergy, 101—their emoluments compared with those of eminent practitioners in law and medicine, 102-3—Sydney Smith's 'Letters to Archdeacon Singleton,' 103-4—private income in many cases more than ecclesiastical income, 105—motives by which those who enter the Church as a profession are generally led, 106-7—clerical adventurers, 108-10—Dr. Chalmers in favour of ecclesiastical sinecures, 111—real cause of the great increase in the wealth of the clergy, 112-3—advantages thereof to the whole body, 113—ignorance prevalent on ecclesiastical subjects, 113-4—the curates, 114—pecuniary disinterestedness of the profession, 115—episcopal incomes, 116—principal features in Lord Blandford's Bill, 117—necessity of providing means for improving and extending the education of the clergy, 118—private colleges, 119—ordination fees, and fees and salaries to solicitors acting as officers of the Boards of Queen Anne's Bounty and the Ecclesiastical Commission, 119-20—recommendation of the commissioners for subdividing overgrown parishes as to providing the necessary funds, 120-1—Dr. Phillimore's proposed remedy objectionable, 121-3—on purchasing advowsons and presentations, 124, and *notes*—flaws in Dr. Phillimore's arguments, 125-6—the Irish Tithe Commutation Act, 126—tithes and church rates, 127-8—Mr. Allen's suggestion, 128-9—concluding remarks, 129.
*Erratum*, 632.

F

*French Protestant Refugees*, history of the, review of, 454—important and interesting information contained in Mr. Weiss's book, 454-5—his principal predecessors in the same line of history, 455-6 in what consist the main defects of his work, 456-8—what the real business of the historian should be, 458-9—personal motives and acts now lost in the machinery of great social bodies, 459-60—Mr. Weiss's book indebted for its most marked features and best developed characters to two other works by M. Sayous and M. Bartholmès, 460-1—principal features of the Protestant emigration, 461-73—hospitable reception experienced by the French refugees in all the Protestant countries, 473-4—Defoe's 'Trueborn Englishman,' 474-5—notice of various books describing the cruelties inflicted on the French Protestants, 475-7—General Schomberg, and the Marquis of Ruvigny, 477-9—satirical view of French Protestant emigrants given in the 'Spectator,' and in Hogarth's 'Noon,' 480-1—this brought about by the many scandals amongst them, 481-2—dangerous nature of their religious fanati-

cism, 482-3—ill-will against them on account of their interference in politics, 483-4 — their general behaviour and morals highly spoken of by Skelton and others, 485 — Memoirs of Sir Samuel Romilly, 485-6—French congregations insensibly absorbed in the English community, 486-7—Jacques Saurin, 487-8—his sermons and independent bearing, 489-93.

G

*Government Education Measures* for Poor and Rich, Parliamentary Bills and Reports on, 158—general view of the subject of Government Education, 158-61—extract from Mr. Tremenheere's 'Notes 'on Public Subjects in the United States and Canada,' 161—Lord John Russel's praiseworthy efforts in the cause of Educational Reform, 162 — three of the principal points in which it still lags behind the wants of the age, 162-3 — necessity of extending education to the most destitute and degraded classes, 163-9—plans proposed to infuse life into the education of the middle classes, 162-72—reform of the Universities and public schools, 172-7—how are fellowships to be thrown open? 177-83 — Government measures of reform directly affecting the Universities, 183-6—University Extension, 186-9—on the reorganisation of the professional body, 189-93 — proposition to endow all the most important professorships, 193—inert state of the Theological Faculty at Oxford, 193-4—paucity of enlightened and energetic pastors in the Church of England, 194-5—concluding remarks, 195-6.

I

*Italian Autobiographies*, recent, review of, 557—remarks on 'Lorenzo 'Benoni,' and 'Castellamonte,' 557-8 — Marie Louise, Grand Duchess of Parma, *ib.*—rise and progress of the revolution in Parma, 588-9 — want of foresight and organisation among the leaders, 559—consequent failure of the badly conducted attempt, 560—serious and manly tone of the 'Lorenzo Benoni,' *ib.*—some account of its author, 560-1—public education in Piedmont, 561-4, and *extracts*—the government of the State precisely analogous to the bad system of education adopted in the universities, 564—general torpor or frivolity pervading the upper and middle classes, 565 — the higher class of Italian revolutionists honourably distinguished from their countrymen by their high intellect, noble patriotism, and exalted motives, 566—several such mentioned by name, 566-7—evidence in the autobiography of Lorenzo Benoni of its author's fine intellect, pure moral character, and genial nature, 567—cause of the prime movers and chief actors in Italian revolutions being generally so young, 567-8, and *extracts*—the revolutions of 1831 compared with those of 1848, 569—Piedmont then and now, 570—encouragement for Italy to be derived from the successful exertions of the Piedmontese constitutionalists, 571—and from the present state of Europe, 572-3.

*Judges* (*the*), on Codification. See *Codification.*

L

*Locke, John*, the Works of, review of, 383—influence of John Locke over the intellectual world, and causes thereof, 383-4—his principal characteristics, 385-8 — his contrast with German philosophers, 388-9—his love of truth, 389-90—his learning, patient excogitation, and independence of authority, 390-1, and *note*—his powers of observation and union of comprehensiveness and sagacity, 392-4 —his insensibility to all the forms of the Beautiful, 394-5—his sense of humour and his powers of raillery, 395-7, and *extracts*— his plain, homely, and practical style, 398-9—his moral excellences, especially his prudence, 399-400—his independence and rectitude of character, 400-1 — his social and conversational habits, 401-2, and *extract*— remarks on his Philosophy, 402—his 'Essay on the Understanding,' 432-4—many of the extravagancies of the Sensational school charged upon him, 404-6—his expressions sometimes inconsistent, 406—his plain and reiterated avowal that he traces human knowledge not to one, but to *two* distinct sources, viz. Sensation or Reflection, 407-8, and *extract* and *note* — M. Cousin's complaint that Locke is self-contradictory considered, 408-9—his charge against Locke for being the head of the Sensational school, 409-14—many passages of his Essay wherein he proves the absurdity and untenableness of the arguments and position of the Sensationalists, 414-8—his definition of 'cause' and 'substance,' 418-20, and *extract*, — further proofs in Locke's 'Reasonableness of Christianity,' and in his 'Commentary on Paul's 'Epistles,' of his opposition to the views maintained by the Sensationalists, 420-1 — Leibnitz's fair view of Locke's line of argument, 421-2—conclusive evidence as to Locke's real opinions on the subject of sensation and reflection, 422-8—strictures on the unfair treatment Locke has met from M. Cousin, 428-34 — M. Cousin justified in charging Mr. Locke with want of method and occasional obscurity, 434-40 — Locke's indefensible notions of 'personal identity,' 440-41 — his over-estimate of education, 441-2 —his chapter on 'Power,' 442-3 — M. Cousin's objections thereto, 443—controversy on the 'Freedom of the Will,' 444-53, and *notes*, —concluding remarks, 453-4.

M

*Madras* (*Presidency of*), Public Works in, notice of the Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into and report upon the system of superintending and executing, 130—the system of irrigation, 130-2—astonishing increase in the amount and value of the produce, 132-3—the two systems of channels and tanks, 133-4 —present state of the tanks and reservoirs, 134-5—certain remuneration for capital expended in irrigation, 135-6—instance of improvement by irrigation in the Tinnevelly district, 136-7, and *extracts*—loss occasioned by not maintaining an efficient system of irrigation, 137-8, and *extract*—striking effects of the extension of irrigation to be found in the delta of the Godavery, 138-9—similar

effects of irrigation in the Madras Presidency, 139—state of the roads in the Madras country, 140-1—in the Tanjore, the Salem, the Cuddapah, and Bellary districts, 141-3—efforts of the Government to improve the means of internal communication, 143-4—the western Trunk Road, and the western road to Madras, 144-6—increase of trade and traffic in salt, 146—improvements in the back waters of Malabar, Cochin, and Travancore, 147, *extract*—the port of Coringa, and efforts directed to making it the principal port for the shipment of cotton, 147-8—remunerating returns on Government advances for purposes of irrigation, 148-9—obstacles in the Ryotwar system to progressive improvement, 149-52—suggestions of the Commissioners, 152—onerous duties of a Board of Works, 152-5, and *note*—general view of financial matters in the Presidencies of Madras and Bengal, 155-7, and *note*.

*Memorials of Mr. Fox.* See *Russell* (*Lord John*).

*Mormonites, the*, review of works concerning, 319-20—account of the book entitled 'The Manuscript Found,' 320-1—its uniform dulness, tameness, and nonsense, and its gross violations of grammar, 321—Joseph Smith, 322-4—Martin Harris, 324-5—Joseph Smith's 'revelations,' 325-6—Sidney Rigdon joins Smith, and urges him to take bolder steps 326-7,—rapid progress of the Sect, 327—the Mormonites first settle at Kirtland, whence they remove to Jackson County, Missouri, 328—determined opposition of the other settlers against their remaining there, 329-30, and *extract*—Joseph Smith establishes a bank, which fails soon after, 330—his revelations as to his people returning to, and reconquering their 'Zion,' 331-2—obliged to flee from Jackson County, and take refuge with the remnant of his proselytes in Illinois, 332—increasing with astonishing rapidity, the Mormonites establish a new settlement, and build the town of Nauvoo, 333—its rapid progress, and its body of Militia, 333-4—correspondence of General Bennett with Joseph Smith, 334—a new 'revelation' allowing of polygamy to Smith and all whom he pleased to license, 335—'spiritual marriage,' *ib.*—rebellion against his authority and pretensions, 335-6—fatal result thereof to Joseph and Hiram Smith, 336—character of the blasphemous impostor, 337-8—Brigham Young takes Smith's place as seer, revelator, and president of the Latter Day Saints, 339—being again persecuted by their neighbours, the Mormonites resolve to migrate in a body beyond the Rocky Mountains, 339-40—account of their leaving Nauvoo and journeyings through Missouri on their way to the promised land, 340-3—their sufferings during their first winter, 344—fertility of the soil, and wonderful prosperity of the new commonwealth, *ib.*—their trade, manufactures, and population, 345—their systematic plan of founding a new town, 345-6, and *extracts*—San Bernardino and the Territory of Utah, 346-7—indignation against Mormon polygamy, 348—active measures of self-defence taken by the leaders, 349—invitation and pecuniary assistance offered to those of their sect in other countries to go out and join them, 349-51—Mormonism considered as a Religion, 351-3—their views on the Resurrection,

353-4—their peculiar rite of baptism for the dead, 354-5—grand temple in which 'place only can this important mystery be celebrated, 355-6—their materialising dogmas, 356-7—their tendency towards Polytheism, Atheism, and Pantheism, 358-9—the Mormon 'pluralistic' marriage service, 360-1, and *extract*—these matrimonial innovations not exactly popular amongst the fair sex, 361-2—correspondence between Cousin Abby and Cousin Nelly, 362-4—reasons assigned in favour of polygamy, 365-6—Mr. Gunnison's testimony as to the bad effects of polygamy at Utah, 367—'spi-'ritual wifeism,' 367-8—the regular payment of tithes the chief duty impressed upon the 'Saints,' 368—their festive meetings, 368-9, and *note*—remarkable absence of the *devotional* element in their religion, 369-70—their original hymns execrable both in taste and feeling, 371, and *extracts*—immense and irresponsible power possessed by the President, 372—the hierarchy, 372-3—Brigham Young, 373-4—Orson Pratt, and his brother Parley Pratt, 374-5—the skilful system of establishing Mormonite missions in foreign countries, 375-6—Mormonites at Manchester, Merthyr Tydvil, and other places in Great Britain, 376-7, and *note*—causes of the success of Mormonism, 378-80—its permanent success, especially at Utah, improbable, 380-2—concluding remarks, 382-3.

*Moore, Thomas*, Memoirs of, 494—proofs of his popularity as a poet, politician, and social companion, 494-5—general outline of his life:—graduates at Trinity College, Dublin, 495—is in London in 1799, where he publishes his translation of the 'Odes of 'Anacreon,' which he dedicates to the Prince of Wales, 495-6—extracts from letters to his mother, 496-7—Lord Moira appoints him Registrar of the Admiralty Court of Bermuda, 497—his duel with Lord Jeffrey, 498—is introduced to Lord Byron, at the dinner-table of Mr. Rogers, in 1811, 499—Byron's fondness for his company, *ib.*—joins the Kilkenny theatrical society, 500—where he becomes acquainted with Miss Elizabeth Dyke, whom he marries, *ib.*—is disappointed in his hopes of being advantaged by Lord Moira's patronage, 500-2, and *notes*—becomes a visitor at Holland House, and exerts his talents in the service of the Whigs, 502—whilst composing his 'Lalla Rookh,' supports himself by writing newspaper *facetiæ*, satires, 'Melodies,' and songs, *ib.*—extraordinary success of 'Lalla Rookh,' 503-4—his trip to Paris, 504—his Bermuda misfortune, 504-5—commences the 'Life of Sheridan,' 506—takes a continental tour with Lord John Russell, 507—visits Lord Byron at Venice, 507-8—travels through Bologna, Florence, Rome, &c., and arrives in Paris in 1820, 509—his tender attachment to his wife, *ib.*—returns to England, and takes up his abode at Sloperton Cottage, *ib.*—composes his 'Loves of the Angels,' and the 'Fables of the Holy Alliance,' 509-10—justly open to the charge of mis-statement in his 'Life of Sheridan,' 510-1, and *note*—that biography a work, nevertheless, of great merit, 511, and *extract*—numerous instances in the Diary of Moore's application to his literary labours, 511-2—after completing his 'Life of

'Sheridan,' Moore pays a visit to Sir Walter Scott at Abbotsford, 512—enthusiasm displayed by the people of Edinburgh when he goes to the theatre in company with Lord Jeffrey, Sir Walter Scott, and Mr. Thomson, *ib.*—Lord Jeffrey's favourable opinion of the 'Life of Sheridan,' *ib.* and *extract*—called to Dublin on account of the illness and death of his father, *ib.*—liberal offer of the lord-lieutenant, Lord Wellesley, 513—writes facetious and satirical verses for 'The Times' newspaper, *ib.*—causes of his pecuniary embarrassment, notwithstanding the vast sums realised by everything he produced, *ib.*—history of the gift, sale, and ultimate destruction of Lord Byron's 'Memoirs,' 513-5, and *note*—familiarity of the style of conversation at Bowood, 515-6, and *extract*—terms of remuneration settled for his 'Epicurean' and 'Life of Byron,' 516—state of political parties in 1826-8, 517—death of his daughter Anastasia, in 1829, *ib.*—having finished the 'Notices of the 'Life of Byron,' Moore sets to work to collect materials for that of Lord Edward Fitzgerald, *ib.*—visits Ireland, where he makes a speech to two or three thousand people, which is most enthusiastically received, *ib.*—paucity of 'adventures,' properly so called, in these Memoirs, *ib.*—Moore's political opinions, 518—charge brought against Moore by some newspapers of having 'dangled 'upon the great,' completely groundless, 518-9—his admirable tact and good sense in his intercourse with the nobility of both sexes, 519—eminent and estimable persons amongst his intimate friends, *ib.*—remarks upon the pride Moore felt in being able to record the favour with which his friends regarded him, 519-21—Mrs. Moore's amiable and domestic virtues, 521—many witticisms and excellent sayings of Sydney Smith, Luttrell, Rogers, Robert Smith, Jekyll, and others, recorded in his Diary, 521-4, and *extracts*—observations regarding Lord John Russell's editorial notes and preface, 524-5—his description of Sydney Smith's wonderful colloquial powers, 525-6, and *extract.*

N

*National Gallery*, the, Report of, review of, 526—origin and constitution of the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the state and management of the National Gallery, 526-7—zeal, patience, and impartiality with which the Committee have discharged their duties, 527—four principal heads into which the Committee have divided their subject, 527-8—the existing management of the Gallery, 528-31—the general results of such management, 531—especially as regards the preservation and cleaning of the pictures, 531-9—results of the present management on the acquisition of pictures, especially by purchase, 539-40—few of the early painters of Italy, Germany, and Flanders, and of the greatest ones of Spain and France, represented in our Gallery, 540-1—what and how purchases have been made, 541-5—evidence of mismanagement brought out before the Committee, 545-6—resolutions adopted by the Committee for the future control of the National Gallery, 546-7—views of Mr. Dyce, Mr. Ford, and Sir Charles

Eastlake as to the expediency of appointing a supreme dictator to have the management of the national pictures, 548-9—impolicy and injustice of impugning every act of the Trustees, 549, *note*—proposition by Sir Charles Eastlake to place the National Gallery under the management of a permanent board, 549-51—anxiety of the Committee to discover a safe and effective mode of picture-cleaning, 551, and *note*—their views regarding the making a national gallery of paintings instructive as well as interesting, 552, and *extract*—proposed sites on which to erect the new National Gallery, 552-6.

*Note to Article I.*, 315-7.

*Note*, 631-2.

O

*Ottoman Empire*, the, review of books treating of, 282-3—brief summary of the state of affairs between Turkey and Russia, 283-4 peculiar position of the Christians under Mussulman rule, 284-5—probable future for Turkey, 285—her lessons in military and naval war under French, Prussian, and English officers, 286-7—proofs of incurable decay in Mussulman domination, 287—the want of roads and the bad tenure of land, 288-9, and *extracts*—the government of the Ottoman Empire an organised system of rapacity and corruption, 290-2—vicious mode of raising the revenue, 292—unstable condition of the government, 293-5—the Christians still subject to many grievances, 295-6—the Gul Khana edict, 296-8, *extract*—contest between Christianity and Islamism, 298—present actual condition of the Ottoman Empire, 299-9—difficulty of reconciling the Christian and Turkish elements, 300-1—the difficulty still further complicated by the Greeks, 301-2—activity and enterprise of the Greek traders, 302-3—education general amongst the Greeks, 304—cruelties perpetrated in the Turkish Empire upon Rayahs, 304-5—all Europe requires some efficient barrier against Russian encroachment, 305—the Christian populations of the East by no means anxious to place themselves under the protection of Russia, 305-6—in supporting Turkey against Russian aggression, England has no intention of encouraging the oppressive policy pursued by Turkey against the Christians, 307—Turkey's first successes against Russia by no means decisive of her superiority, 308-9—the Danubian Principalities, 310-1—the question of protecting the Christians considered, 311-2—concluding observations, 312-4.

P

*Parliamentary Legislation*, the Machinery of, review of reports, returns, and books relating to, 243-4—necessity of organisation and system, 244—increase in the powers and activity of Parliament, 244-5—our Parliamentary forms lag behind our requirements, 245-6—our reverence for custom and precedent, 246-7—the Speaker of the House of Commons, and his onerous duties, 247-8—long sessions, and unseasonable hours, 248-51—heavy 'business for

'the day,' 251—Parliamentary Committees, 252-3—confusion of subjects, and absence of classification in the business of the House, 254-6—accumulation of crude measures as the close of the Session approaches, 256-60—useful rule adopted by the present Speaker, 260-1—Committees of Supply, and Ways and Means, 261-3—Saturday sittings, 263—modifications of our Parliamentary rules and regulations in the American House of Representatives and French Chamber of Deputies, 264—long debates, and provisions against their becoming frequent, 264-5—*la clôture*, and the one hour rule, 265—expedients suggested for bringing the Session to a close at an earlier period of the year, 266—new financial year, 267-8—important question relating to the interior organisation of Parliament, 268-9—Committees of the whole House and Select Committees, 269-70—proposition to revive the ancient Grand Committees, 270-2—the history of the repeal of the Advertisement Duty, 272-3—the experiment of Grand Committees further considered, 273-4—the examples of France and America, 274-5—on the drawing of Acts of Parliament, 276-8—present inefficient system of committees on Private Bills, 279-81—Mr. Cardwell's proposition for an improved constitution of railway committees, 281—concluding observations, 282.

*Presidency of Madras.* See *Madras* (*Presidency of*).

R

*Russell* (*Lord John*), his Memoirs of Mr. Fox, and the Buckingham Papers, review of, 1—Memorials of Mr. Fox, by whom collated and published, 1-2—the Buckingham Papers, and the numerous editorial blunders contained therein, 2-4, and *notes*—Mr. Fox's first seat in the House of Commons as a Junior Lord of the Admiralty, 4—his gambling habits, 5, and *extract*—resigns his seat in 1772, *ib.*—first breach between Mr. Fox and Lord North, 5-6—incurs liabilities by his deep play to the amount of 140,000*l.*, 6, and *note*—incenses George III. by his independent conduct, 7, and *note*—puts an end to his connexion with Lord North, and goes into Opposition, 8—his conduct on the American war, 8-10, and *notes* and *extracts*—his success in Opposition, 10—endeavours made to gain him over to join Lord North's Ministry, 10-1, and *extract* and *note*—the King's determined spirit against the Opposition, 12-3—fresh overtures for the formation of a Coalition Government, 13-5—opposed by the King, 15, and *extract*—curious extract from a letter of Lord North to the King, 15-6, and *extract*—Lord Holland's, Mr. Allen's, and Lord John Russell's remarks thereon, 16, and *extract*—Parliamentary proceedings of the Opposition in 1780-2, 17—George III.'s determined resolution to keep them out of power, 17-8—Lord North's resignation, 18, and *extract*—history of the formation of the new Ministry, 18-22, and *notes* and *extracts*—Fox's separation from Lord Shelburne, ascribed to their misunderstandings respecting the exact duties of the Home and Foreign Secretaries, 23-4—account of Mr. Oswald's mission to Paris to negotiate with Franklin the preliminaries of peace,

24-37, and *notes* and *extracts*—Lord Holland's remarks on this resignation of Mr. Fox, 37—Mr. Fox's own account, 37-8—Lord Shelburne, 38-40, and *notes*—remarks on Mr. Fox's rupture with that Minister, 40-3—abortive efforts of Mr. Pitt to induce Mr. Fox to return to office, 43-4, and *extract* and *notes*—he joins the new Administration as one of the Secretaries of State with Lord North, 45-6—this a very ill-advised step, 46-8, and *notes*—George III.'s dislike of the Coalition Ministry, 48-50—opening of the Session, with Pitt as leader of the Opposition, 50-1, and *notes*—supposed injury done to the United Kingdom by the loss of the American colonies, 51, *note*—Mr. Fox's India Bill rejected by the Lords, and consequent resignation of Mr. Fox and Lord North, 52—Mr. Pitt forms a Government, 52-3—and maintains it for sixteen years, in spite of the strenuous opposition on the part of Mr. Fox and his adherents, 53-5—Mr. Pitt's India Bill, 55-6—anxiety of the King lest Fox should prove successful, 56-7—Lord John Russell's remarks upon the effects of the Coalition, and the consequent disruption of the Whig party, 58—concluding observations respecting our Parliamentary Constitution, 58-60.

T

*Thackeray's Works*, review of, 196—his 'Vanity Fair,' 196-7—characters of Amelia and Becky, 197—interview between Mr. Sedley and Captain Dobbin, 197-8, *extract*—quarrel between Mrs. Sedley and Amelia, 198-9, *extract*—George Osborne and William Dobbin, 199-200, *extract*—Becky's method of leading Amelia into a second marriage, 200, *extract*—Amelia's son, and her grief at parting with him, 201-2—skilful delineation of the character of Amelia, 202—Becky the impersonation of intellect without virtue, 203—her thoughts while visiting at a country-house, in which she formerly lived as governess, 203-4, *extract*—her up-hill and almost hopeless career, 204-5—Captain Rawdon Crawley, 205, *extract*—three partings on the eve of Quatre Bras, 205-7, *extract*—Becky amongst the fashionables of London, 207-8, *extract*—Becky's downward course, 208-9—Mr. Thackeray's mistake in making his comic characters murderers, 209-10—his 'Pendennis,' 210-2—conversation between Captain Costigan and his daughter, the Fotheringay, 213-4, *extract*—whether sensitive or impassible natures make the best actors, 214—Johnson's and Diderot's opinion on the matter, 214-5—Major Pendennis, 215-6—Miss Blanche Amory, a contrast with Becky Sharp, 216-7—conversation between Sir Francis Clavering and Captain Strong, 217-8, *extract*—Becky a simple character, Blanche an inconsistent one, 219—the Simple, the Mixed, and the Inconsistent in fictitious characters, 219-20—the Simple character that most frequently depicted by the poet, 220-1—fine illustrations of the Mixed character in Shakspeare's Henry the Fifth and Hotspur, 221—the Inconsistent character, as drawn by Pope, Cervantes, and Shakspeare, 222-3—Othello, 223-5—Mr. Thackeray's Blanche and Rawdon Crawley, two of his best drawn inconsistent characters, 225-6—his Arthur Pendennis a mixed

character, 226—his 'Esmond,' 227-32—scenes from the first volume, 233-4, *extracts*—the character of Beatrix, 234-7, and *extracts*—the Jesuit Father Holt and James the Third, 237—the author's vivid description of still life, 238-9, *extracts*—his defects, 239-40—his merits, 241—his 'English Humourists,' 241-2—concluding remarks, 242-3.

U

*United Kingdom,* consumption of food in the, review of Parliamentary Papers relating to, 581—importance of ascertaining the effects on the country of the Acts of 1846, and other Acts establishing freedom of trade, 582—the principle of Free Trade as it affects Bread, 582-3—statistical information respecting wheat and other grains, 583—important and encouraging facts deducible therefrom, 584—want of correct information regarding the annual home production of food, 584-5—such correct information a great desideratum and one easily to be procured, 585-6—memorial to Government from the merchants of London praying that measures be taken to remedy the grievance, 586—the effect of Free Trade on Sugar, 586-7—increased consumption of Tea since Mr. Gladstone's reduction of the duty, 587—abundance of Parliamentary and other evidence to prove that cheapness of bread, tea, sugar, and other necessaries of civilised life, is a great blessing to the labouring classes, 588-9—examination of statistics relied on by Protectionists as proving their views, 589-90—advantages enjoyed by the country under a Free Trade policy during times of scarcity, 590-1—important and conclusive fact in favour of Free Trade, 591—the consumption of Animal Food in the United Kingdom, 592—important facts elicited and established by the results of the measures for cheapening Sugar, 592-603—their effects on the produce of sugar in the West India Islands, 603-5—the demand made by the West India planters for further compensation both audacious and fallacious, 605-6—effects of Free Trade in Sugar on the production of Mauritius, 606—the distress of our sugar-growing colonial possessions of prior existence to the Free Trade policy, 606-7—steadiness of price one of the advantages of that policy, 607—grand and cheering results as regards Sugar, 608—our trade in Coffee, 608-11—its amount under Protection and under Free Trade 611-4—growing liking for Chicory, 614-5—our trade in Tea, 615—effects produced upon its consumption by the change from Monopoly to Free Trade, 615-8—increased consumption of Tea during periods of cheapness in bread and meat, 618-9—the sum and results of Free Trade in tea nearly double both in the consumption thereof, and the revenue thence derived, 620—our trade in Cocoa, *ib.*—our trade in Tobacco, *ib.*—effects of Free Trade measures upon its consumption, 621-2—our trade in Wines, 622—what effects Free Trade has had upon their import and consumption, 622-3—our trade in Spirits, home and foreign, 623-4—our trade in Beer, 624—general summary of preceding facts and data, 624-5—remark of Sir Josiah Child in favour of a free course of

trade, 626—England's commercial prosperity under the commonwealth, as depicted by Edmund Waller, now fully realised by her prosperity under Free Trade, *ib.*—probable effects of the present war upon British trade and commerce, 626-7—the line of policy laid down respecting goods of a neutral on board an enemy's ship examined, 628-9,and *note*—wisdom and humanity of restricting the operations of war to the regular organised military and naval forces of the country, 629—Sir Archibald Alison's declarations respecting privateering, 629-30, *extract*—reasonable assurance of success with which England embarks in the contest with Russia, 631.

END OF VOL. XCIX.

LONDON:
A. and G. A. SPOTTISWOODE,
New-street-Square.

19507

P LE E Edinburgh Review.
Vol. 99, 1854.

University of Toronto
Library

DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket
LOWE-MARTIN CO. LIMITED